DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 391 IR 052 289

AUTHOR Weech, Terry L.
TITLE Report on 1987 Evaluation of the Illinois Board of Higher Education's Cooperative Collection Management Program.
INSTITUTION Illinois Association of Coll. and Research Libraries, Urbana.
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Board of Higher Education, Springfield.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 70p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; *Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Library Administration; *Library Collection Development; Program Evaluation; Questionnaires; Shared Library Resources; *Specialists; State Programs; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

An evaluation of cooperative collection management among academic libraries participating in the Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix (ICAM) was conducted in March 1987 by the Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries (IACRL) and the Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE). Data were gathered from two questionnaires, one of which was sent to the 28 ICAM libraries and the other to 58 ICAM subject specialists. The response rate was 82% for the institutional questionnaire (23 library directors), and 62% for the subject specialist questionnaire (36 subject specialists). Analyses of the data obtained through the questionnaires indicated that, overall, subject specialists and library directors were satisfied with the IACRL/IBHE efforts on cooperative collection development (CCD), although ratings of the various aspects of the program differed between the two groups. Additional evaluations based on ICAM data and other sources investigated the percentage increase of library collections; bibliographic and physical access provided by the libraries; subject specialists' assessment of values; internal validity of the Existing Strength Collection (ESC) and Current Collection Intensity (CCI) codes used in ICAM; and alternative funding models. Appended materials include copies of the two ICAM questionnaires; a tally of the responses to the institutional questionnaire; a summary of the responses to the subject specialist questionnaire; comparisons of ICAM collection growth among four Illinois university libraries and all ICAM libraries; and a comparison of research level collections as indicated by ESCs in the 1986 ICAM. (CGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291391

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

REPORT ON 1987 EVALUATION OF THE ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S COOPERATIVE COLLECTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM.

SUBMITTED TO THE IACRL/IBHE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COOPERATIVE COLLECTION MANAGEMENT

BY

TERRY L. WEECH

FUNDED BY THE ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

OCTOBER, 1986 - JUNE, 1987

IR053289

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Terry L. Weech
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

REPORT ON 1987 EVALUATION OF THE ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION'S COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

SUBMITTED TO THE IACRL/IBHE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COOPERATIVE COLLECTION MANAGEMENT

BY

TERRY L. WEECH

FUNDED BY THE ILLINOIS BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

OCTOBER, 1986-JUNE, 1987.

Printed November, 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE 3

SUBJECT SPECIALIST QUESTIONNAIRE 5

EVALUATION BEYOND THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Percentage Increase of Collections 9

Bibliographic and Physical Access 9

Subject Specialists' Assessment of Value 21

Internal Validity of ESC and CCI codes 22

Alternative Funding Models 23

CONCLUSIONS 27

ATTACHMENTS

The 1987 ICAM Institutional Questionnaire A-1

The 1987 ICAM Subject Specialist Questionnaire B-1

Tally of the 1987 ICAM Institutional Questionnaire. C-1

Summary of Results of 1987 ICAM Subject Specialist Questionnaire D-1

Comparison of ICAM Collection Growth .....

DePaul University Library E-1

Eastern Illinois University Library E-3

Illinois State University Library E-5

University of Illinois - U/C Library E-7

All ICAM Libraries E-9

Comparison of Research Level Collections as Indicated by ESC's in 1986 ICAM F-1

INTRODUCTION

The Illinois Board of Higher Education (IBHE) established a task force in 1977 to explore ways to improve cooperation among academic libraries in Illinois. The task force was enlarged in 1978 and became the IACRL (Illinois Association of College and Research Libraries)/IBHE Liaison Committee. During the early years of this liaison committee the concerns included a statewide circulation system, a statewide interlibrary delivery system, and resource sharing.

In 1984 the liaison committee established a subcommittee to explore cooperative collection development. This subcommittee, chaired by Glenn Scharfenorth, developed a plan for cooperative collection development utilizing the RLG (Research Libraries Group) conspectus and an evaluative tool called the Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix (ICAM) which is based on the LCS (Library Computer System) database which lists the holdings of some twenty-seven Illinois academic libraries.

In 1986, the IBHE provided approximately $183,000 for cooperative acquisitions in Illinois academic libraries. In 1987, $172,000 was available. The IACRL/IBHE subcommittee on cooperative collection management supervised the process of granting the awards.

An evaluation component was part of the subcommittee's program for cooperative collection development. In 1986, a pilot evaluation was done and reported in the Summer, 1986 issue of the IACRL NEWSLETTER. For 1987, a more extensive evaluation was requested. Both directors of libraries and subject specialists were surveyed. Selected libraries were visited to verify bibliographic and physical access to the materials purchased. The results of the 1987 evaluation are found in this report.

1987 EVALUATION OF COOPERATIVE COLLECTION DEVELOPMENT

In March of 1987 libraries participating in the Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix (ICAM) were sent a questionnaire headed "The 1987 ICAM Institutional Questionnaire". A copy of this questionnaire is presented in Attachment A. At the same time subject specialists who had participated in the ICAM assessment process were sent a questionnaire headed "The 1987 ICAM Subject Specialist Questionnaire". A copy of this questionnaire is Attachment B to this report.

Twenty-three of the twenty-eight, or 82% of the libraries receiving institutional questionnaires, responded. Thirty-six of the fifty-eight, or 62% of the subject specialists, responded. The tabulation of the results of the institutional questionnaires is presented in Attachment C and the results of the subject

specialists are given in Attachment D. Because not all respondents provided usable answers to all questions, the "N" or number of responses may vary from question to question.

REVIEW OF FINDINGS OF INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE:

The results of the institutional questionnaire suggest that participating libraries view the title data in ICAM as generally accurate and the National Shelf List categories as appropriate for their collections. The Existing Strength of Collection (ESC), Current Collection Intensity (CCI) indicators and Language indicators are also viewed as tending to be appropriate for their collections by most of the respondents. The grant application Guidelines and Goals are perceived as clear by a majority, but the overall assessment of the IACRL/IBHE CCD process is not as highly rated, with only 32% giving it a rating above a neutral "3" and 28% indicating a rating toward the "poor" end of the scale. (See question 5, Attachment C.)

Question six asks if data on in-house use, intra-institutional use, inter-institutional use and institutional affiliation and user status is available from current records kept by the participating library. Only inter-institutional use (such as interlibrary loan) is available from the records in the majority of libraries. If other data on use is perceived as of value, it

will have to be obtained from sources other than the current records of the participating libraries.

Question seven reveals that less than half of the libraries have been involved in collection assessment in the last five years, other than ICAM. This may suggest that even with acknowledged shortcomings of the ICAM process in its development stages, the majority of libraries are being exposed to collection assessment that they might not have otherwise undertaken.

Questions eight through ten deal with the use of the ICAM process for local collection management. Provision of dollar amounts of materials added annually and inclusion of comments made by subject specialists when ICAM data is submitted are the only two expansions the majority perceived as potentially helpful. A comparison of all institutions on one ICAM subject was the only "custom" printout the majority of the respondents felt would be of use. Sixty-three percent indicated they would be willing to pay for such custom printouts.

Question eleven asks the respondents to list the next five subject areas they would like to see considered for ICAM qualitative assessment. There was a considerable scattering of responses, but Political Science and Psychology had the greatest number of "1" rankings. Philosophy had the next highest number of "1" rankings. Religion, Computer Science, and Engineering/

Technology would be next in line if "1" and "2" rankings are considered.

REVIEW OF FINDINGS OF SUBJECT SPECIALIST QUESTIONNAIRE:

Comparing the first two questions of the subject specialist questionnaire with those of the institutional questionnaire, it became evident that the subject specialists are more critical of the title data and the National Shelf List subject categories used in ICAM than are the library directors who completed the institutional questionnaire. A majority of the subject specialist respondents, in fact, tend to consider the title data as inaccurate and the subject categories as inappropriate for their collections. When responses to question three are compared, however, subject specialists perceive the ESC, CCI, and Language indicators as much more appropriate to their subject specialization than the library directors do to their general collection. One explanation for the difference in perception might lie in the fact that the subject specialists themselves are responsible for assigning the ESC, CCI, and Language indicators.

The subject specialists were even more impressed with the clarity of the grant application Guidelines and Goals than the library directors. They were not quite as critical in their overall assessment of the IACRL/IBHE CCD process as the library directors

were. Again, these perceptions might be influenced by the fact that the subject specialists were more involved than the directors in the training and prior collection assessment processes of ICAM.

Question six on the subject specialist questionnaire asked for an estimate of collection growth in the past two years in the subject specialization of the specialist. Many did not respond to this question, but of those that did, most indicated low or moderate growth for their subject areas. The few subjects which had high growth indicated were matched with the percentage increase indicated in the matrix for FY 85 and FY 86.

Little relationship was found between the perception of the subject specialists and the ICAM data on percentage increase, suggesting that the ICAM data may not be an accurate or a valid indicator of collection growth at this time. Follow-up telephone calls to selected subject specialists revealed that some of the largest increases in the ICAM database resulted from retrospective conversion of titles recently entered into the LCS database. In other cases, large increases were attributed to one-shot efforts to meet curriculum needs in a given area. The developers of ICAM are aware of data limitations and are working on improving the validity of the data. The results of question six suggest that such improvement is much needed. For now, specific percentage increases must be interpreted on a case-by-

case basis. Future evaluations should monitor fluctuations and determine patterns and trends over time.

Question seven asked about special problems, if any, with the ICAM matrix data. There was a considerable response to question seven. If more than one respondent indicated the same or a similar comment, the number of such comments is indicated within parentheses. The comments are as follows:

> ICAM ignores microforms, serials, government documents, and audio tapes. (4)
>
> Large undercount between institution's shelflist count and ICAM. (4) Education, Sociology, Literature.
>
> Problem of DDC to LC conversion [in areas other than Literature] (3)
>
> Within music (M 1-4) analytical entries distort the title count. Clearer guidelines for entering such data in LCS might help. (3)
>
> Special collections often not included in ICAM. (3)
>
> Categories too broad. (2)
>
> "Divergent ends collections must serve."
>
> Fiction classified PZ under old schedule and not reclassified.
>
> Many bibliographies previously classed in Zs, now would be PR or PS.
>
> "The LC classification does not specify if computer science was to be included in mathematics. Also, computer science, a major collection area for us, recently was assigned a phoenix schedule (004-006). If computer [science] was included in the math count, did the count include 510.78 only or were the newly assigned numbers included?"
>
> "The sciences tend to rely more on journals and serial publications than on books for research. Each serial

publication shows up as 1 title in the matrix - the same as a book. This is a real problem when trying to use the matrix to determine what an institution's collection is really like in the sciences."

"Too much unevenness exists in reality, which cannot be generalized."

"Widely different needs which collections must serve, from major research collections to those designed to meet specific curricular needs."

"Does not differentiate percent of collection at readership level; e.g., how much is research, how much popular, how much text."

"Important topics such as general biochemistry and physiology (574.19), evolution and genetics are not specified."

Separate computer science from mathematics.

Language codes for music irrelevant.

Music classification does not address sound recordings.

Institution uses five collection levels while ICAM uses four.

A text should accompany ICAM in the future to summarize patterns as a teaching tool and to aid new selectors.

Question eight in the subject specialist questionnaire confirms the lack of prior assessment studies in most of the participating libraries. When asked how ICAM might be modified or expanded, only the provision of dollar amounts of materials added annually and the inclusion of comments made by subject specialists when submitting ICAM data were perceived as desirable by the majority of the respondents. (A perception also held by the library directors.) Custom printouts were not perceived as helpful, nor were the subject specialists willing to pay for them. (In contrast to the responses from the library directors.)

EVALUATION BEYOND THE QUESTIONNAIRES:

1) Determination of median percentage increase of collections as represented in ICAM data:

FINDINGS: After considerable manipulation of the ICAM data using Lotus 1,2,3, it was determined that the median percentage presented a considerable complexity to the process. In this exploratory testing of the procedure, the mean percentage is used. A sample of the results are presented in Attachment E. The process was also complicated by the fact that both version 1A and version 2 of Lotus have been used on the ICAM data. Not all files translate from one version to another without special procedures.

2) Checking of bibliographic and physical access to materials purchased with FY 86 grant funds:

FINDINGS: Access through LCS and OCLC is indicated in Table 1. The results in Table 1 should be considered preliminary, since the holding institutions have not been contacted to verify the absence of holding information in the indicated database. The results do indicate, however, the access a practiced user of the two databases would have using the information provided the potential user population by Illinois Libraries, which listed the

grant recipients and the materials they purchased. So, even if the holding library later demonstrates that the items are in the two databases, the findings in Table 1 suggest a level of access available to many users.

It should be noted that six of the seventeen single institutional awards were not listed in LCS. Five of the single institutional awards could not be found among the holdings statements in OCLC. If considered in terms of percentage of total single institutional grants, 35% were not found in LCS and nearly 30% were not found in OCLC.

The multi-institutional grants did not fare much better, but as noted in Table 1, there was considerable difficulty in locating the multi-institutional grants on artificial intelligence in both online databases. All in all, improvements in bibliographic access on LCS and OCLC to materials purchased with grant funds could be made. Future evaluation efforts might explore the impact of specific improvement models.

TABLE 1
RESULTS OF LCS AND OCLC SEARCH FOR FY 86 GRANT MATERIALS

INSTITUTION (Subject)	TITLE	LCS	OCLC	REMARKS
Chicago State (Sociology)	Slavery: Catalyst for Conflict (Microformat = M)	no	no	
DePaul (Literature)	Playbills from Harvard Theatre Collections (M)	yes	yes	No circ.
	Charles Dickens Original Ms. (M)	no	yes	
(Visual Arts)	Fashion Costumes & Uniforms (M)	yes	yes@	No circ.
	Jewelry Gallery in V.A. Museum (M)	yes	yes	No circ.
(Sociology)	Papers of Eleanor Roosevelt (M)	yes	yes	No circ.
	Papers of League of Wm Voters (M)	yes	yes	No circ.
IL State (Visual Arts)	Collection of o.p. Art Exhibit Catalogues...1950-70	yes	yes	No circ.
SIU-C (Sociology)	Nat Criminal Justice Ref Serv.(M)	yes	yes	
(Literature)	American Poetry, 1609-1870 (M)	no	no	
UI-Chicago (Visual Arts)	Knoedler Lib of Art Exhibition Catalogues (M)	no	no	
(Sociology)	Claude A. Barnett Papers (M)	yes@@	yes@	
UI-Urbana (Sociology)	Chronicle Data Service (Machine-readable data file)	no	no	
(Mathematics)	Russian Mathematical Monographs 1940-1979 (M)	no	no	
(Sociology)	U.S. Military Intelligence Rpts Surveillance of Radicals 1917-41 (M)	yes@@	yes	
(Literature)	Britain's Literary Heritage (M)	yes@@	yes@	
(Visual Arts)	Royal Inst. of Brit. Architects The Drawings Collections (M)	yes	yes@	

Table 1 (cont.)

Multi-Institution Award:

Only five of the thirteen items were located in LCS. Five were also located on OCLC. In general, there was considerable difficulty in locating these items on both online services.

Note: When a listing takes more than three screens in LCS, complete holdings of noncirculating collections cannot be searched on LCS except at the holding institution.

@ Multipart series. Some but not all parts were located on OCLC with the library receiving the grant listed as the holding library.

@@ Multipart series. Some but not all parts were located on LCS with the library receiving the grant listed as the holding library.

The local bibliographic and physical access to materials purchased with FY 86 grant funds was checked in three of the libraries receiving a larger proportion of the grant funds. The University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign; DePaul University; and the University of Illinois, Chicago; were each visited by the principle investigator and a research assistant.

Local Bibliographic Access - UIUC

The week of June 22, 1987, the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (UIUC) libraries were visited to determine access to items received in FY 86 as part of the collection development grants from the Illinois Board of Higher Education. The items purchased were: 1) Chronicle Data Service (machine-readable data

file); 2) Royal Institute of British Architects The Drawings Collection (microfilm); 3) Russian Mathematical Monographs (microfilm); 4) U.S. Military Intelligence Reports: Surveillance of Radicals in the U.S. 1917-1941 (microfilm); and 5) British Library Britain's Literary Heritage (microfilm). Multi-institutional awards are not included in this assessment of local access.

Both OCLC and the Illinois version of LCS (Library Computer System) with FBR (Full Bibliographic Record) were searched for cataloging and holdings information on the collection development grant items. Chronicle Data Service and Russian Mathematical Monographs were not found on OCLC. Partial OCLC bibliographic records were found for Royal Institute of British Architects, The Drawings Collection; British Library, Britain±s Literary Heritage. Full OCLC bibliographic records for Surveillance of Radicals were retrieved. Local holdings on LCS/FBR were found for all but the Chronicle Data Service, Russian Mathematical Monographs, and Surveillance of Radicals. Partial holdings on LCS/FBR were found for Britain's Literary Heritage. Thus two of the series purchased with grant funds could not be located by series entry on either OCLC or the local LCS/FBR databases.

Searching these titles on OCLC and LCS/FBR was complicated by incomplete bibliographic data in the Illinois Libraries listings

of institutions and purchases and by incomplete data supplied in the grant proposals. To illustrate, Chronicle Data Service is not the title given by the vendor but is the one supplied in the proposal and in the grant listings. The proposal attachment, an advertisement from the vendor, identifies it as National Data Service for Higher Education. Russian Mathematical Monographs turns out to be the title supplied in the proposal to cover the microfilming of Library of Congress Russian mathematical monographs that are not owned by the University of Illinois libraries. Titles of parts of the series in The Drawings Collection and Britain's Literary Heritage were needed to verify holdings on OCLC and LCS/FBR. It was not entirely clear which of the U.S. Military Intelligence Reports are included under Surveillance of Radicals in the U.S., but only one series of microfilm reels could be found when physical access was attempted.

Local Physical Access - UIUC

The five University of Illinois holding locations for the materials purchased by grant funds were visited. The shelf locations of the micromaterials, the physical storage conditions, the microreader locations, and the physical condition of microreader stations were examined. Location of finding aids, such as homemade or vendor-supplied catalogues of the micromaterials collections, was also sought. Conditions for storing, viewing, and examining micromaterials varied greatly.

In the Education & Social Sciences Library, the Chronicle Data Service currently sat by a subject specialist's desk while the machine-readable data files are being cataloged. Permission from the vendor has been gained for making copies of the floppy disks so that they may circulate. One concern is what should be done to assure that the data that goes out on circulating floppy disks is the data that comes back--i.e., what measures should be taken to prevent erasing data or substituting data on the circulating floppies.

The library staff have prepared an attractive, informative handout on Chronicle Data Service that identifies what was and was not included in the purchase, what the data fields are, what some sample data manipulations are possible. The handout clearly identifies the Illinois Board of Higher Education as the agency that made the purchase possible.

In the Art & Architecture Library, The Royal Institute of British Architects Drawing Collection is kept in a locked cabinet. A staff member retrieves the material for the user. The catalogue alluded to on the film reels is not kept with them, and the library assistants did not know if a catalogue or finding list existed or where it might be located.

The Surveillance of Radicals in the U.S., 1917-1941; and The British Library's Britain's Literary Heritage series are kept in an airconditioned microform collection and reading room on the seventh deck of the main bookstacks. Finding the microforms room requires looking at a deck map and knowing that it is on the seventh deck. However, all deck maps are posted for all decks on each stack level.

Surveillance of Radicals is the only part so identified of the larger U.S. Military Intelligence Reports series, which also includes combat estimates and intelligence reports from Mexico and South American countries. No finding list or paper guide was shelved with either the Surveillance of Radicals or the Britain's Literary Heritage series.

Viewing and storage conditions are good. The microroom has a temperature-and-humidity-controlled environment, and the readers are in semidarkness, with nearly all viewing light projected from the Recordak microfilm reader itself. Details, even of fuzzy typed carbon copies--the source material filmed for the Surveillance of Radicals project--are easy to make out.

The Russian Mathematical Monographs proved to be one of the more difficult items to retrieve. As noted above, they were not accessible through the local catalogs under series title. It appears that the "series title" is really a local description of

the project to obtain microfilm of Library of Congress held items not held by the University of Illinois. All items acquired are thus cataloged under separate titles and are not retrievable as a series. It also appears that not all the items have been received, although the funds have been expended by placing them in a deposit account at the Library of Congress to pay for the items as they become available. The microfiche received to date are housed in the University bookstacks in the microform section. It was not possible to verify specfic titles received under the grant.

Local Bibliographic Access - DePaul University

On Thursday, July 24, 1987 visits were made to two of the FY 86 grant recipients in the Chicago area (DePaul and University of Illinois-Chicago). DePaul had received grants to purchase six separate series. 1) Playbills from the Harvard Theatre Collections; 2) Charles Dickens, Original MS., Annotated Proofs, Manuscript Letters, and Playbills; 3) Fashion Costumes and Uniforms; 4) Jewelry Gallery in the Victoria Albert Museum; 5) Papers of Eleanor Roosevelt; and 6) Papers of the League of Women Voters; Four of the six series were located with a minimum of effort in the local card catalog from the information listed in the FY 86 Grant Recipient list as published in Illinois Libraries. The fifth and sixth series presented more of a challenge. Parts three and four of the four part series Fashion Costumes and Uniforms could be located under series title, but

parts one and two were not accessible through the series title. The microfiche of the original manuscripts, annotated proofs, manuscript letters, playbills, of Charles Dickens were difficult to locate in the DePaul catalog. Separate entries for Original Manuscripts and Annotated Proofs were located, but "manuscript letters" and "playbills" were not located in the DePaul catalog. An entry for "Original Letters" was found, which might be the same as "manuscript letters" on the Illinois Libraries list.

Local Physical Access - DePaul University

With the exception of the Charles Dickens Playbills, all the materials were physically located in the DePaul library and physical access could be described as convenient. Microformat readers were available and well maintained. The staff at the DePaul reference desk could not determine the status of the Dickens Playbill series and suggested we contact the Special Collections staff. They were on lunch break at the time and the schedule did not permit returning that day. A call was made the next day to the Special Collections unit. They reported that the Dickens Playbills could be found in LCS under a title search "Dickens/Playbills" Prior searches in LCS under "Dickens" had been author/title searches, and not title searches. That may account for not finding the bibliographic entry at DePaul. Why the physical item was not located with the other items in the series is not explained. It may have been a oversight on the

part of the investigators, but all the film in similar subject areas were scanned for the missing series.

Local Bibliographic Access - UICC

The second library visited, University of Illinois at Chicago, (UICC) had received two grants in FY 86. 1) The Koedler (sic) Library of Art and the Claude A. Barnett Papers: The Associated Negro Press, 1918-1967. The first item was misspelled in the Illinois Libraries listing, so someone keying in the name of the series as listed would receive a "no matching items" message in the University of Illinois at Chicago online catalog (LUIS). The correct spelling "The Knoedler Library of Art Exhibition Catalogues" yields twelve entries, six for the six of the sub-series of microfiche and six for accompanying print guides. The series actually consists of seven sub-series. The first in the sub-series, "Salons and Annual Exhibitions" was not available in the local catalog. There were fewer difficulties in retrieving the second item. There was an error in the description in the local catalog. The Claude A. Barnett Papers were listed as covering the period 1818 to 1967 when in fact they cover the period 1918 to 1967.

Local Physical Access - UICC

On seeking the physical pieces, it was determined that the call number in the catalog, "microcard N-14" was an error and that it

should read "microfiche N-14". The staff in the microform area had great difficulty locating the material because of the incorrect listing in the catalog. When located, a physical piece with the call number "microfiche N-13" was produced which might represent the "Salons and Annual Exhibitions" item, but this could not be verified since a printed guide was not available nor was there a catalog entry for N-13. The printed guides for the other sub-series were available in multiple copies, with the catalog indicating that copy one was in main reference and that the other copies were in the stacks. When a request was made for the copy ones in main reference, I was told that the reference copies were not available and was instructed to go to the stacks for copies two. Copy two of the guides were found in the stacks. The Claude A. Barnett Papers microfilm was retrieved without difficulty.

All in all, the experience in these three libraries suggests that the bibliographic access is not always consistent with the listings one would expect and that the commitment to catalog by series as well as to provide analytic entries is not always followed. Physical access is also not 100 percent nearly a year after the original grant. Clearly some improvement in quality control of bibliographic and physical access is desired in the libraries visited.

3) Assessment of value of materials purchased with FY 86 grant funds by subject specialists:

FINDINGS: Subject specialists who responded to the March questionnaire were sent copies of the 1986 and 1987 grant recipients listings and were asked to review those awards in their area of subject expertise and rate the awards on a scale from 1 to 5 with 1 = very valuable contribution to overall state holdings in the subject area and 5 = of no value to overall state holdings in the subject area. Because of the small number of awards in Education and Mathematics, subject specialists in those areas were contacted only if they were also subject specialists in other areas with a larger number of awards. Of the remaining twenty subject specialists, all but two were reached by phone and shared their evaluations of the awards. Most perceived the awards to be valuable contributions to the overall state resources in the subject areas, tending to validate the decisions of the grant committee. The bulk of the rankings were 1 or 2. Some gave a ranking of 3, but only five assigned a rank of 4. In most cases 4 was assigned to a given item by only one subject specialist. Others assigned a 1 or a 2 to the same item. The only instance in which two ranks of 4 were assigned was the Drawings Collection of the Royal Institute of British Architects, suggesting that the subject specialists in the visual arts perceived this collection to be of less value to overall state resources.

4) Determine the internal validity of the assignment of ESC and CCI codes within ICAM by matching institutions with similar codes:

FINDINGS: Since ESC codes are most easily matched to title holdings (CCI codes relate to intention and are not necessarily reflected in current holdings), only ESC codes were used in the investigation. Of the twenty-eight libraries participating in ICAM, five indicated that they had "Research Level" collections in Existing Strength of Collection (ESC) Indicators (an indicator of "4"). These ranged from one library which noted a research level collection in one subject category to the University of Illinois which listed research level collections in five of the nine subject categories to which ESCs had been assigned. Initially, the ESCs for all ranges from 1 to 5 were examined in the latest ICAM. But further examination revealed great difficulty in drawing conclusions about 1 thru 3 ESCs (Minimal level of collection, Basic Information Level, and Instructional Support Level). There were no level-5 ESCs (Comprehensive Level) in the matrix. Thus the Research Level was the focus of the study to establish the validity of the ESC indicator. Attachment F provides the data on research level collections in the 1986 ICAM. A considerable range in number of titles held will be noted as the various subject areas are pursued. Some subjects are represented by nearly twenty-eight times the number of titles

in one collection with a Research Level indicator (see M 1495-5000, comparing SIU-C and UIUC). The differences in the other subject categories are not as large, but some reflect research level holdings of titles that are two or three times greater in the larger collections than in the smaller collections. Recognizing that size alone does not assure a research collection, each of these libraries may very well be able to justify the research level assignment of the ESC to their collection. But such differences as those found should at least raise questions and stimulate further investigation of the assignment of research level ESCs to specific collections.

5) Determine possible alternative funding models for Cooperative Collection Development in Illinois:

FINDINGS: The search of the literature during the past ten years did not yield a large number of relevant sources on the topic of alternative funding models. As an indication of the contribution the IACRL/IBHE Subcommittee has made to the literature on the topic, the best single source was the printed papers of the conference sponsored by the Illinois Board of Higher Education and Eastern Illinois University which was conceived and planned by the Subcommittee. A review of the sources suggests the following alternatives to funding patterns for Cooperative Collection Management.

a) Categorical Funding by State or Federal Government Programs:

Federal programs have been limited, but one example is LSCA Title III which has provided funds for different types of libraries to explore cooperation, including cooperative collection development.

State programs of categorical grants for cooperative collection development have ranged from specifying a percentage of the state university libraries budget prior to campus allocation to go to cooperative collection development acquisitions (California), to a state grants formula based on size of collection and number of students served (New York State). I would describe the Illinois funding pattern for academic libraries to be a grant-in-aid program with allocation on a competitive basis.

b) Private Foundation Funding:

The most visible example of private foundation funding is the funding of the Pacific Northwest project by the Fred Meyer Charitable Trust.

c) Self-Funding by Participating Libraries:

At the state level, Colorado provides one of the better examples of self-funding with the program of the libraries in CARL which levied a self-assessment of 1% or less of

their acquisition budget to fund the cooperative collection development project.

At the regional level, cooperative library systems have undertaken cooperative collection development with funding through special system grants and/or libraries reallocating funds from their general acquisition budget for cooperative purchases. Systems in Illinois and Connecticut are representative of this model.

The concept of using resource sharing as an argument for stretching limited budgets for library materials is prevalent in most of the literature. But cooperative collection management implies more than resource sharing. It implies some form of coordination and evaluation. This takes funds in addition to those allocated for acquisition. Illinois seems to be one of the few states to date that has recognized the need to fund the coordination and evaluation activities as well as the acquisitions of materials. Whatever source is eventually determined to be best for funding materials, it is probably best if coordination and evaluation continue to be funded at the state level. Such funding should assure that the vested interests of one or a small group of libraries or institutions will not unduly influence the coordination and evaluation efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SOURCES: Recognizing that it is unlikely that the IBHE can continue to fund a project which was essentially perceived to provide seed money to stimulate activities within the cooperating libraries, we need to consider alternatives to the present method of funding for Illinois. One solution would be to find a private source of money to assist in the project. Such a source would have to provide the money in the form of an endowment if the project is to have a long-term impact. While it is unlikely an endowment of the size necessary to provide sufficient funding on an annual basis could be found, it probably should not be dismissed without further investigation.

The final decision on which model of alternative financing of Cooperative Collection Development should probably be made after the Subcommittee and others have had a opportunity to discuss the possible options. I would encourage a closer look at the California model if state funds are to be the source for support. The California model, with the sense of participation of each institution through assignment of a specific proportion of library budgets to CCD prior to allocation to specific campuses is complicated by the variety of governing bodies for Illinois institutions. But the California model might be modified to provide coordination through the IBHE and include commitments from privately as well publicly funded institutions. In any

case, coordination and evaluation roles should be separately funded from the materials allocation budget in any plan for cooperative collection development.

As noted above, a final recommendation should not be made until a full discussion of the alternatives has taken place. This might best be done at a conference or workshop on the topic with invited resource people. Appropriate resource people could be identified from the literature relating to other cooperative collection development projects. It might be appropriate to have a representative from the field of nonprofit organization fund raising to give a broader perspective.

CONCLUSIONS:

Overall, subject specialists and library directors were satisfied with the IACRL/IBHE efforts on cooperative collection development (CCD). Library directors as a group tended to rate the Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix (ICAM) and the national shelf list (NSL) categories more highly than did the subject specialists. Subject specialists as a group tended to rate more highly the existing strength of collection (ESC) indicators, current collection intensity (CCI) indicators, and language intensity indicators. The two groups' ratings more nearly matched for the ratings on clarity of the goals and guidelines for grant

applications, with almost 60% of the directors giving a 4 or 5 rating, and almost 70% of the subject specialists assigning a 4 or a 5. On the overall CCD process by IACRL/IBHE, about one-third the directors rated it a 4 or 5 and nearly half the subject specialists gave it a 4 or a 5. But another two-fifths of the directors were neutral (gave a "3" rating) on the overall assessment. Differences in the two groups' ratings may stem from their differing involvement in the CCD assessment process. Subject specialists assign the ESC, CCI, and language indicators; and the specialists tended to be relatively more satisfied with the adequacy of these measures. Directors are likely to take a broader view of the CCD process and they tended to rate more highly the ICAM and NSL measures, which provide a broader view of the institution's collection. Directors and subject specialists seemed neutral to approving of the overall CCD process fostered by IACRL and IBHE. With continued evaluation and refinement of the Illinois CCD process, the directors' and subject specialists' approval ratings and management data for intra-institutional and inter-institutional collection development will improve.

THE 1987 ICAM INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The IBHE/IACRL Subcommittee on Cooperative Collection Management asks your help in assessing the Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix (ICAM). Feel free to make comments on the reverse. Your responses will not be identified individually. ONLY ONE OF THESE QUESTIONNAIRES SHOULD BE COMPLETED BY EACH INSTITUTION.

NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE: _____

NAME OF INSTITUTION: _____

Please answer the following questions by circling the number on the 1 - 5 scale which most applies.

1. How would you assess the title data which appears in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 Very Accurate

2. How would you assess the 495 National Shelf List subject categories which are used in the left column of the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

3. How would you assess the appropriateness of the following for your collection?

a) ESC (Existing Strength of Collection) indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

b) CCI (Current Collection Intensity) indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

c) Language indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

4. How would you assess the clarity of the Guidelines and Goals for grant application?

Not Clear 1 2 3 4 5 Very Clear

5. What is your overall assessment of the Cooperative Collection Development process undertaken by the IACRL/IBHE Subcommittee?

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

In an attempt to determine the potential methods for evaluating the success of the cooperative collection management program, your response to the following questions will be most helpful.

6. Would it be possible to determine the following from the current records you maintain on use in your library?

a. Would data on in-house use (use not recorded on circulation records) be available for items purchased by cooperative collection management funds?

____yes _____no Comments:

b. Would data on intra-institutional (local users) use be available for items purchased by cooperative collection management funds?

____yes ____no Comments:

c. Would data on inter-institutional (LCS, ILL, etc.) use be available for items purchased by cooperative collection management funds?

____yes ____no Comments:

d. Would data on institutional affiliation and user status (Faculty, student, etc.) be available for items purchased by cooperate collection management funds? *

____yes ____no Comments:

(*Laws and policies protecting the confidentiality of individual users would be followed if this information is requested.)

7. Are you aware of any studies of collection strength or collection assessment processes which have included your library (other than ICAM) in the last five years? ____ yes ____ No

If yes, please list details, include a summary of the results, or provide the name and telephone number of a contact person who might provide more information:

8. The IACRL/IBHE Subcommittee on Cooperative Collection Management would like input on how the ICAM matrix might be modified or expanded to provide data which might be helpful to you and your library for local collection management decisions.

	YES	NO
a. More specific breakdown of subject areas in the matrix? (If yes, indicate on reverse the breakdown preferred)	___	___
b. Groupings of subject areas by broad disciplines?	___	___
c. Provide dollar amount of materials added annually?	___	___
d. Inclusion of Comments made by Subject Specialists when ICAM data is submitted?	___	___

e. Other? (please specify):

9. Would "custom" printouts of the ICAM matrix providing the following data be of use?

	YES	NO
a. Comparison of two institutions for all ICAM subjects?	___	___
b. Comparison of all institutions on one ICAM subject?	___	___

c. Other (please specify):

10. Would you be willing to pay for these custom printouts? ___Yes ___No

11. Nine subject areas have been assessed qualitatively by cooperating libraries. What are the next five subject areas which you would like us to consider for qualitative assessment? (The nine done to date are: American History, American Literature, Biology, Education, English Literature, Mathematics, Music, Sociology, and the Visual Arts. Please refer to the National Shelf List subject categories as listed on ICAM in selecting the next five subject areas you would like assigned Existing Strength of Collection and Current Collection Intensity indicators.)

1.

2.

3.

4.

5.

Other Comments: (Use reverse if necessary)

THANK YOU FOR PROMPTLY COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE RETURN TO:

TERRY L. WEECH
1306 S. ORCHARD
URBANA, IL 61801

ATTACHMENT B

THE 1987 ICAM SUBJECT SPECIALIST QUESTIONNAIRE

The IBHE/IACRL Subcommittee on Cooperative Collection Management asks your help in assessing the Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix (ICAM). Feel free to make comments on the reverse. Your responses will not be identified individually. ONLY ONE QUESTIONNAIRE SHOULD BE COMPLETED BY AN INDIVIDUAL FOR A GIVEN SUBJECT AREA. IF YOU HAVE A SPECIALIZATION IN MORE THAN ONE OF THE AREAS LISTED BELOW, PLEASE USE A SEPARATE QUESTIONNAIRE FOR EACH SUBJECT AREA.

NAME OF PERSON COMPLETING QUESTIONNAIRE: _____

AREA OF SPECIALIZATION REPRESENTED IN RESPONSES TO THIS QUESTIONNAIRE (CIRCLE ONLY ONE)

AMERICAN HISTORY AMERICAN LITERATURE BIOLOGY EDUCATION

ENGLISH LITERATURE MATHEMATICS MUSIC SOCIOLOGY VISUAL ARTS

NAME OF INSTITUTION: _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER WHERE WE MIGHT CONTACT YOU: ____-____-_____

Please answer the following questions by circling the number on the 1 - 5 scale which most applies.

1. How would you assess the title data for the specialization circled above which appears in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 Very Accurate

2. How would you assess the National Shelf List subject categories representing your subject speciality which are used in the Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

3. How would you assess the appropriateness of the following for your area of subject specialization?

a) ESC (Existing Strength of Collection) indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

b) CCI (Current Collection Intensity) indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

c) Language indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

4. How would you assess the clarity of the Guidelines and Goals for grant application?

Not Clear 1 2 3 4 5 Very Clear

5. What is your overall assessment of the Cooperative Collection Development process undertaken by the IACRL/IBHE Subcommittee?

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

6. For the subjects which you consider yourself a specialist listed in the ICAM matrix, please give your estimate of the collection growth in the past two years (fy85-fy86) by LC # listed in the matrix (eg.; PS 991-3390 for American Literature: 19th Century)

LOW MODERATE HIGH

ICAM SUBJECT AREA (LC #) _____ Growth _____
1 3 5

ICAM SUBJECT AREA (LC #) _____ Growth _____
1 3 5

ICAM SUBJECT AREA (LC #) _____ Growth _____
1 3 5

ICAM SUBJECT AREA (LC #) _____ Growth _____
1 3 5

ICAM SUBJECT AREA (LC #) _____ Growth _____
1 3 5

ICAM SUBJECT AREA (LC #) _____ Growth _____
1 3 5

ICAM SUBJECT AREA (LC #) _____ Growth _____
1 3 5

(USE REVERSE FOR ADDITIONAL SUBJECT AREAS IF NECESSARY)

7. What special problems, if any, do you see in interpreting the ICAM matrix data for your area of specialization? (Feel free to note special collections not included, or areas under represented, etc.)

8. Are you aware of any studies of collection strength or collection assessment processes which have included materials in your area of specialization in your library (other than ICAM) in the last five years?
____ yes ____ No

If yes, please list details, include summaries of the results, or provide the name and telephone number of a contact person who might provide more information:

9. The IACRL/IBHE Subcommittee on Cooperative Collection Management would like input on how the ICAM matrix might be modified or expanded to provide data which might be helpful to you and your library for local collection management decisions. For your area of specialization, please indicate responses to the following:

	YES	NO
a. More specific breakdown of subject areas in the matrix? (If yes, indicate on reverse the breakdown preferred)	___	___
b. Groupings of subject areas by broad disciplines?	___	___
c. Provide dollar amount of materials added annually?	___	___
d. Inclusion of Comments made by Subject Specialists when ICAM data is submitted?	___	___

e. Other? (please specify):

10. Would "custom" printouts of the ICAM matrix providing the following data be of use?

	YES	NO
a. Comparison of two institutions for all ICAM subjects?	___	___
b. Comparison of all institutions on one ICAM subject?	___	___

c. Other (please specify):

11. Would you be willing to pay for these custom printouts? ___Yes ___No

12. Other comments or observations:

THANK YOU FOR PROMPTLY COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE. PLEASE RETURN TO:

TERRY L. WEECH
1306 S. ORCHARD
URBANA, IL 61801

ATTACHMENT C

TALLY OF THE 1987 ICAM INSTITUTIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer the following questions by circling the number on the 1 - 5 scale which most applies.

1. How would you assess the title data which appears in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Inaccurate 1 2 3 4 5 Very Accurate

RESULTS						
N=21	0%	14%	43%	38%	5%	No Respose = 2

2. How would you assess the 495 National Shelf List subject categories which are used in the left column of the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

RESULTS						
N=22	9%	9%	32%	41%	9%	No Response = 1

3. How would you assess the appropriateness of the following for your collection?

a) ESC (Existing Strength of Collection) indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

RESULTS						
N=22	5%	14%	36%	27%	14%	No Response = 1

b) CCI (Current Collection Intensity) indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

RESULTS						
N=22	0%	14%	41%	32%	14%	No Response = 1

c) Language indicators which are used in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Not Appropriate for our collection 1 2 3 4 5 Very Appropriate for our collection

RESULTS
N=22 0% 14% 23% 41% 23% No Response = 1

4. How would you assess the clarity of the Guidelines and Goals for grant application?

Not Clear 1 2 3 4 5 Very Clear

RESULTS
N=22 9% 9% 23% 50% 9% No Response = 1

5. What is your overall assessment of the Cooperative Collection Development process undertaken by the IACRL/IBHE Subcommittee?

Poor 1 2 3 4 5 Excellent

RESULTS
N=22 14% 14% 41% 27% 5% No Response = 1

In an attempt to determine the potential methods for evaluating the success of the cooperative collection management program, your response to the following questions will be most helpful.

6. Would it be possible to determine the following from the current records you maintain on use in your library?

a. Would data on in-house use (use not recorded on circulation records) be available for items purchased by cooperative collection management funds?

RESULTS 24% yes 76% no (N = 21) Comments:

b. Would data on intra-institutional (local users) use be available for items purchased by cooperative collection management funds?

RESULTS 35% yes 65% no (N = 20) Comments:

c. Would data on inter-institutional (LCS, ILL, etc.) use be available for items purchased by cooperative collection management funds?

RESULTS 62% yes 38% no (N = 21) Comments:

d. Would data on institutional affiliation and user status (Faculty, student, etc.) be available for items purchased by cooperate collection management funds? *

RESULTS 24% yes 76% no (N = 21) Comments:

(*Laws and policies protecting the confidentiality of individual users would be followed if this information is requested.)

7. Are you aware of any studies of collection strength or collection assessment processes which have included your library (other than ICAM) in the last five years?

RESULTS 43% yes 57% no (N = 23)

8. The IACRL/IBHE Subcommittee on Cooperative Collection Management would like input on how the ICAM matrix might be modified or expanded to provide data which might be helpful to you and your library for local collection management decisions.

	YES	NO	"N"
a. More specific breakdown of subject areas in the matrix? (If yes, indicate on reverse the breakdown preferred)	37%	63%	19
b. Groupings of subject areas by broad disciplines?	32%	68%	19
c. Provide dollar amount of materials added annually?	67%	33%	18
d. Inclusion of Comments made by Subject Specialists when ICAM data is submitted?	74%	26%	19

e. Other? (please specify):

The whole process needs to be more quantitative. The ESC is purely arbitary and can't be compared.

Scope Notes

Some accommidation in the subject areas to allow participation by small libraries.

Improve system for evaluation collections classed by Dewey.

Assessment of date of material.

9. Would "custom" printouts of the ICAM matrix providing the following data be of use?

	YES	NO	"N"
a. Comparison of two institutions for all ICAM subjects?	21%	79%	19
b. Comparison of all institutions on one ICAM subject?	75%	25%	20

c. Other (please specify):

Both custom printouts might be useful after matrix data is accurate

10. Would you be willing to pay for these custom printouts?

RESULTS 63% yes 37% no (N = 19)

11. Nine subject areas have been assessed qualitatively by cooperating libraries. What are the next five subject areas which you would like us to consider for qualitative assessment? (The nine done to date are: American History, American Literature, Biology, Education, English Literature, Mathematics, Music, Sociology, and the Visual Arts. Please refer to the National Shelf List subject categories as listed on ICAM in selecting the next five subject areas you would like assigned Existing Strength of Collection and Current Collection Intensity indicators.)

Rank	1	2	3	4	5
Agriculture			1		1
Anthropology	1				2
Business	1		4	1	
Economics		2		3	1
Marketing				1	
Chemistry	1		1		
Computer Science & DP	1	2		1	
Constitutional History & Adm, U.S.		1			
Dancing			1		
Engineering/Technology	1	2		1	1
European History		2			
Foreign Languages			1		1
Romance Languages		1			
Geography/Geology	1				
History, General & Old World			1		
Journalism					1
Law	1				
Law, U.S.	1				
Library Science				1	
Medicine	1			3	
Nursing	1		1		1
Military Science				1	
Naval Science					1
Philology/Linguistics	1				
Philosophy	2	2			1
Religion	1	3	1		2
Religion, Christian	1		1		
Religion, Non-Christian		1	1		
Photography	1				
Physics		1	1	2	
Political Science	3		2	1	
Psychology	3	1	1		2
Science			1		
Theatre		1			
Transportation & Communication				1	
Doesn't Matter	1				

ATTACHMENT D

SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF 1987 ICAM SUBJECT SPECIALIST QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How would you assess the title data for your specialization which appears in the revised Illinois Collection Analysis Matrix?

Inaccurate	1	2	3	4	5 Very Accurate	TOTAL
AM HIST		2	1			3
AM LIT	2	2				4
BIOLOGY	1	2	1			4
EDUC	2		2	1		5
ENG LIT	2	2				4
MATH	1	1	1	1		4
MUSIC	2	1	2	1		6
SOCIOLOGY	1	1	1	1		4
V. ARTS	1	1	1			3
TOTAL...	12	12	9	4		37
PERCENT	32.43%	32.43%	24.32%	10.81%		100.00%

2. How would you assess the National Shelf List subject categories representing your subject speciality as used in ICAM?

Not Appropriate	1	2	3	4	5 Very Appropriate	NR*	TOTAL
AM HIST		1		2			3
AM LIT		3	1				4
BIOLOGY		2	1	1			4
EDUC		2		1	1	1	4
ENG LIT		3	1				4
MATH		3		1			4
MUSIC	1	3		1	1		6
SOCIOLOGY	1	1	1	1			4
V. ARTS	1	1		1			3
TOTAL...	3	19	4	8	2		36
PERCENT	8.33%	52.78%	11.11%	22.22%	5.56%		100.00%

*NR indicates a non-response or other response.

3a. How would you assess the ESC indicators in the revised ICAM?

Not Appropriate	1	2	3	4	5 Very Appropriate	TOTAL
AM HIST				3		3
AM LIT			1	3		4
BIOLOGY			1	3		4
EDUC			2	3		5
ENG LIT			1	3		4
MATH			2	1	1	4
MUSIC	1			4	1	6
SOCIOLOGY				4		4
V. ARTS				2	1	3
TOTAL...	1	0	7	26	3	37
PERCENT	2.70%	.00%	18.92%	70.27%	8.11%	100.00%

3b. How would you assess the CCI indicators used in the revised ICAM?

Not Appropriate	1	2	3	4	5 Very Appropriate	TOTAL
AM HIST				3		3
AM LIT				4		4
BIOLOGY			1	3		4
EDUC			2	3		5
ENG LIT				4		4
MATH			2	1	1	4
MUSIC	1			4	1	6
SOCIOLOGY				4		4
V. ARTS				2	1	3
TOTAL...	1	0	5	28	3	37
PERCENT	2.70%	.00%	13.51%	75.68%	8.11%	100.00%

3c. How would you assess the language indicators used in the revised ICAM?

Not Appropriate	1	2	3	4	5 Very Appropriate	TOTAL
AM HIST				3		3
AM LIT				3	1	4
BIOLOGY			1	3		4
EDUC		1	1	3		5
ENG LIT				4		4
MATH			2	1	1	4
MUSIC	1			4	1	6
SOCIOLOGY				4		4
V. ARTS				2	1	3
TOTAL...	1	1	4	27	4	37
PERCENT	2.70%	2.70%	10.81%	72.97%	10.81%	100.00%

4. How would you assess the clarity of the Guidelines and Goals for grant application?

Not Clear	1	2	3	4	5 Very Clear	TOTAL
AM HIST				2	1	3
AM LIT			1		3	4
BIOLOGY		1		1	2	4
EDUC		2	1	1	1	5
ENG LIT			1		3	4
MATH		1		1	2	4
MUSIC			2	2	2	6
SOCIOLOGY		1	1	1	1	4
V. ARTS			1		2	3
TOTAL...	0	5	7	8	17	37
PERCENT	.00%	13.51%	18.92%	21.62%	45.95%	100.00%

5. Overall assessment of CCD process undertaken by IACRL/IBHE?

Poor	1	2	3	4	5 Excellent	TOTAL
AM HIST		1	1	1		3
AM LIT		1	1	1	1	4
BIOLOGY		1	1	2		4
EDUC	1		1	3		5
ENG LIT		1	1	1	1	4
MATH	1	1		2		4
MUSIC		1	1	2	2	6
SOCIOLOGY		1	3			4
V. ARTS		1	1	1		3
TOTAL...	2	8	10	13	4	37
PERCENT	5.41%	21.62%	27.03%	35.14%	10.81%	100.00%

(Responses to questions #6 and #7 are given in the body of the Report, pages 2-3.)

8. Are you aware of studies of collection strength or collection assessment which included materials in your specialization in your library?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST	1	2		3
AM LIT	1	3		4
BIOLOGY		4		4
EDUC		4	1	5
ENG LIT		4		4
MATH	1	3		4
MUSIC	1	5		6
SOCIOLOGY	1	3		4
V. ARTS		3		3
TOTAL...	5	31		36
PERCENT	13.89%	86.11%		100.00%

9a. Would you like a more specific breakdown of subject areas in ICAM?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST	1	2		3
AM LIT	1	2	1	4
BIOLOGY	3	1		4
EDUC	2	2	1	5
ENG LIT	1	2	1	4
MATH	2	2		4
MUSIC	3	2	1	6
SOCIOLOGY	1	3		4
V. ARTS	1	1	1	3
TOTAL...	15	17		32
PERCENT	46.88%	53.13%		100.00%

9b. Would you like a grouping of subject areas by broad disciplines?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST	2	1		3
AM LIT		3	1	4
BIOLOGY	1	2	1	4
EDUC	1	3	1	5
ENG LIT	1	2	1	4
MATH		4		4
MUSIC		4	2	6
SOCIOLOGY	2	2		4
V. ARTS		2	1	3
				0
TOTAL...	7	23		30
PERCENT	23.33%	76.67%		100.00%

9c. Would providing dollar amounts of materials added annually be helpful?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST	1	2		3
AM LIT	1	2	1	4
BIOLOGY	2	2		4
EDUC	2	2	1	5
ENG LIT	2	2		4
MATH	2	2		4
MUSIC	2	2	2	6
SOCIOLOGY	3	1		4
V. ARTS	1	1	1	3
				0
TOTAL...	16	16		32
PERCENT	50.00%	50.00%		100.00%

9d. Would inclusion of comments made by subject specialists when submitting ICAM data be helpful?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST	2	1		3
AM LIT	2	1	1	4
BIOLOGY	3		1	4
EDUC	4		1	5
ENG LIT	2	1	1	4
MATH	3	1		4
MUSIC	3		3	6
SOCIOLOGY	3	1		4
V. ARTS	2		1	3
				0
TOTAL...	24	5		29
PERCENT	82.76%	17.24%		100.00%

10a. Would "custom" printouts comapring two institutions for all ICAM subjects be helpful?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST		3		3
AM LIT		4		4
BIOLOGY		2	2	4
EDUC	1	3	1	5
ENG LIT		4		4
MATH	1	2	1	4
MUSIC	1	2	3	6
SOCIOLOGY	1	3		4
V. ARTS	1	2		3
				0
TOTAL...	5	25		30
PERCENT	16.67%	83.33%		100.00%

10b. Would "custom" printouts comparing all institutions on one ICAM subject be helpful?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST	1	2		3
AM LIT		3	1	4
BIOLOGY	2	1	1	4
EDUC	3	1	1	5
ENG LIT		4		4
MATH	1	2	1	4
MUSIC	3	2	1	6
SOCIOLOGY	2	2		4
V. ARTS	1	2		3
				0
TOTAL...	13	19		32
PERCENT	40.63%	59.38%		100.00%

11. Would you be willing to pay for these custom printouts?

	YES	NO	NR	TOTAL
AM HIST		2	1	3
AM LIT		3	1	4
BIOLOGY		3	1	4
EDUC	1	1	3	5
ENG LIT		3	1	4
MATH	1	2	1	4
MUSIC	2	2	2	6
SOCIOLOGY		2	2	4
V. ARTS		3		3
				0
TOTAL...	4	21		25
PERCENT	16.00%	84.00%		100.00%

ATTACHMENT E

COMPARISON OF ICAM COLLECTION GROWTH

Contents:

Comparison of growth by NSL category for DePaul Univ. Library..... E-1

Comparison of growth by NSL category for Eastern Illinois Univ. Library..... E-3

Comparison of growth by NSL category for Illinois State Univ. Library..... E-5

Comparison of growth by NSL category for Univ. of Illinois-Urbana/Champaign Library..... E-7

Comparison of growth by NSL category for all ICAM libraries..... E-9

	NATIONAL SHELFLIST LC/SUBJECT CATEGORIES		DePaul 85				DePaul 86				
			TL	ESC	CCI	%	TL	ESC	CCI	%	CHANGE
68.	E 1-139	History of Americas: General, Indians, North America	304			0.141%	326	3A/E	3A/E	0.140%	7.24%
69.	E 140-200	United States, Colonial, Special Topics	1,127			0.521%	1,191	3B/E	3B/E	0.513%	5.68%
70.	E 201-299	United States, Revoluntionary Period	333			0.154%	338	3A/E	3A/E	0.146%	1.50%
71.	E 301-440	United States, 1790-1855	421			0.195%	441	3A/E	3A/E	0.190%	4.75%
72.	E 441-655	United States, Slavery and Civil War	1,280			0.592%	1,302	3B/E	3B/E	0.561%	1.72%
73.	E 656-867	United States Since the Civil War	800			0.370%	853	3A/E	3A/E	0.367%	6.63%
74.	F 1-205	State & Local History: New England, Atlantic Coast	222			0.103%	229	1/E	1/E	0.099%	3.15%
75.	F 206-475	State & Local History: South, Gulf States	288			0.133%	322	1/E	1/E	0.139%	11.81%
76.	F 476-705	State & Local History: Midwest, Mississippi Valley	311			0.144%	336	2/E	2/E	0.145%	8.04%
77.	F 721-854	State & Local History: The West	135			0.062%	157	1/E	1/E	0.068%	16.30%
78.	F 856-975	State & Local History: Pacific Coast, Alaska	113			0.052%	123	1/E	1/E	0.053%	8.85%
120.	HM	Sociology: General Works, Theory	425	3B/E	3B/E	0.196%	586	3B/E	3B/E	0.252%	37.88%
121.	HN	Sociology: Social History and Conditions, Etc.	938	3B/E	3B/E	0.434%	945	3B/E	3B/E	0.407%	0.75%
122.	HQ	Family, Marriage, Woman, Sexual Life	512	3B/E	3B/E	0.237%	639	3B/E	3B/E	0.275%	24.80%
123.	HS	Societies: Secret, Benevolent, etc.	37	1/E	1/E	0.017%	52	1/E	1/E	0.022%	40.54%
124.	HT	Communities, Classes, Races	905	3B/E	3B/E	0.418%	1,148	3B/E	3B/E	0.494%	26.85%
125.	HV	Social Pathology, Welfare, Criminology	3,307	3A/E	3B/E	1.528%	3,578	3A/E	3B/E	1.541%	8.19%
147.	L	Education-General	1,853			0.856%	1,927	3A/E	3B/E	0.830%	3.99%
148.	LA	History of Education	612			0.283%	633	2/E	3A/E	0.273%	3.43%
149.	LB	Theory & Practice of Education	4,462			2.062%	4,774	3A/E	3B/E	2.056%	6.99%
150.	LC	Special Aspects of Education	1,539			0.711%	1,765	3A/E	3A/E	0.760%	14.68%
151.	LD	Education: Individual Institutions: United States	413			0.191%	430	1/E	1/E	0.185%	4.12%
152.	LE	Education: Institutions: America (Except United States)	11			0.005%	10	1/E	0	0.004%	-9.09%
153.	LF	Education: Individual Institutions: Europe	73			0.034%	75	1/E	0	0.032%	2.74%
154.	LG	Education: Institutions: Asia, Africa, Oceania	18			0.008%	25	0	0	0.011%	38.89%
155.	LH	College & School Magazines and Papers	3			0.001%	3	0	0	0.001%	0.00%
156.	LJ	Student Fraternities and Societies	48			0.022%	48	0	0	0.021%	0.00%
157.	LT	Textbooks	0			0.000%	0	2/E	2/E	0.000%	ERR
158.	M 1-4	Music: Collections, Manuscripts, Collected Works, etc.	47			0.022%	47	3A/NA	3B/NA	0.020%	0.00%
159.	M 5-1490	Instrumental Music, Music Before 1700	729			0.337%	777	3B/NA	3B/NA	0.335%	6.58%
160.	M 1495-5000	Vocal Music	328			0.152%	343	3B/NA	3B/NA	0.148%	4.57%
161.	ML	Literature of Music	2,524			1.167%	2,697	3B/E	3B/E	1.162%	6.85%
162.	MT	Musical Instruction and Study	237			0.110%	251	3B/E	3B/E	0.108%	5.91%
163.	N	Visual Arts (General)	1,102	2/E	2/E	0.509%	1,248	2/E	2/E	0.538%	13.25%
164.	NA	Architecture	450	2/E	2/E	0.208%	502	2/E	2/E	0.216%	11.56%
165.	NB	Sculpture	228	2/E	2/E	0.105%	271	2/E	2/E	0.117%	18.86%
166.	NC	Graphic Arts (General), Drawing, Design	162	1/E	2/E	0.075%	182	1/E	2/E	0.078%	12.35%
167.	ND	Painting	919	2/E	2/E	0.425%	1,036	2/E	2/E	0.446%	12.73%
168.	NE	Print Media: Printmaking, Engraving, Lithography, etc.	130	1/E	2/E	0.060%	147	1/E	2/E	0.063%	13.08%
169.	NK	Decorative Arts, Applied Arts, Crafts	158	1/E	1/E	0.073%	199	1/E	1/E	0.086%	25.95%
170.	NX	Arts in General	123	2/E	2/E	0.057%	150	2/E	2/E	0.065%	21.95%
316.	PR 1-78	English Literature: Literary History and Criticism	10,356	3B/E	3B/E	4.786%	10,820	3B/E	3B/E	4.660%	4.48%
317.	PR 81-151	History of English Literature, General	0	3A/E	3A/E	0.000%	0	3A/E	3A/E	0.000%	ERR

			DePaul 85				DePaul 86				
318.	PR 161-479	History of English Literature, by Period	0	3A/E	3A/E	0.000%	0	3A/E	3A/E	0.000%	ERR
319.	PR 500-978	History of English Literature, by Form (Poetry, Drama, etc)	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	ERR
320.	PR 1098-1395	English Literature: Collections	1	2/E	2/E	0.000%	0	2/E	2/E	0.000%	-100.00%
321.	PR 1490-1799	Anglo-Saxon Literature	87	3B/E	3B/E	0.040%	90	3B/E	3B/E	0.039%	3.45%
322.	PR 1803-2165	Anglo-Norman and Early Middle English Literature	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	ERR
323.	PR 2199-2405	English Renaissance Literature, Prose and Poetry	2	3B/E	3B/E	0.001%	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	-100.00%
324.	PR 2411-2416	English Renaissance Drama: Anonymous Plays	1	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	-100.00%
325.	PR 2417-2749	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights A-Sha;	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	ERR
326.	PR 2750-3112	Shakespeare	1	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	1	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	0.00%
327.	PR 3135-3198	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights Shar-Z	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	0	3B/E	3B/E	0.000%	ERR
328.	PR 3291-3785	English Literature, 17th and 18th Centuries	2	3B/E	3B/E	0.001%	2	3B/E	3B/E	0.001%	0.00%
329.	PR 3991-5998	English Literature, 19th Century	10	3B/E	3B/E	0.005%	11	3B/E	3B/E	0.005%	10.00%
330.	PR 6000-6049	English Literature, 1900-1960	2	3BE/2E	3BE/2E	0.001%	2	3BE/2E	3BE/2E	0.001%	0.00%
331.	PR 6050-6076	English Literature, 1961-	1	2/E	2/E	0.000%	1	2/E	2/E	0.000%	0.00%
332.	PR 8309-9899	English Literature: Provincial, Colonial, etc.	0	2/E	2/E	0.000%	0	2/E	2/E	0.000%	ERR
333.	PS 1-478	American Literature: General, Criticism, History	6,812			3.148%	7,166	3B/E	3B/E	3.086%	5.20%
334.	PS 501-690	American Literature: Collections	2			0.001%	2	2/E	2/E	0.001%	0.00%
335.	PS 700-893	American Literature: Colonial Period	0			0.000%	0	3B/E	3A/E	0.000%	ERR
336.	PS 991-3390	American Literature: 19th Century	5			0.002%	5	3B/E	3B/E	0.002%	0.00%
337.	PS 3500-3549	American Literature: 1900-1960	12			0.006%	12	3AE/2E	3AE/2E	0.005%	0.00%
338.	PS 3550-3576	American Literature: 1961-	9			0.004%	9	2/E	2/E	0.004%	0.00%
344.	QA 1-99	Mathematics (General)	2,741	3B/E	3/F	1.267%	3,067	3B/E	3/F	1.321%	11.89%
365.	QA 101-145	Arithmetic	206	2/F	2/F	0.095%	217	2/F	2/F	0.093%	5.34%
366.	QA 150-299	Algebra	1,371	3A/F	3/F	0.634%	1,461	3A/F	3/F	0.629%	6.56%
367.	QA 300-433	Mathematical Analysis (Calculus, etc.)	288	3B/F	3B/F	0.133%	325	3B/F	3B/F	0.140%	12.85%
368.	QA 440-799	Geometry, Trigonometry	270	2/F	2/F	0.125%	282	2/F	2/F	0.121%	4.44%
369.	QA 801-939	Analytic Mechanics	179	2/F	3A/F	0.083%	186	2/F	3A/F	0.080%	3.91%
387.	QH 1-199	Natural History (General)	7			0.003%	7	3A/E	3A/E	0.003%	0.00%
388.	QH 201-278	Microscopy	49			0.023%	53	3A/E	3A/E	0.023%	8.16%
389.	QH 301-705	Biology (General)	1,466			0.678%	1,565	3B/E	3B/E	0.674%	6.75%
390.	QK 1-474	Botany (General)	61			0.028%	66	3A/E	3A/E	0.028%	8.20%
391.	QK 475-989	Botany (Specific Fields)	846			0.391%	911	3A/E	3B/E	0.392%	7.68%
392.	QL 1-355	Zoology (General)	77			0.036%	78	3A/E	3A/E	0.034%	1.30%
393.	QL 362-739	Invertebrate and Vertebrate Zoology	971			0.449%	1,024	3A/E	3A/E	0.441%	5.46%
394.	QL 750-991	Ethology, Anatomy, Embryology	511			0.236%	548	3B/E	3B/E	0.236%	7.24%
395.	QM	Human Anatomy (B)	124			0.057%	136	3A/E	3A/E	0.059%	9.68%
396.	QP 1-348	Physiology (General) (B)	1,236			0.571%	1,292	3B/E	3B/E	0.556%	4.53%
397.	QP 351-499	Nervous System and the Senses(B)	40			0.018%	40	3A/E	3B/E	0.017%	0.00%
398.	QP 501-801	Animal Biochemistry (B)	171			0.079%	174	3A/E	3A/E	0.075%	1.75%
399.	QP 901-981	Experimental Pharmacology (B)	0			0.000%	0	1/E	1/E	0.000%	ERR
400.	QR	Microbiology (B)	200			0.092%	208	3B/E	3B/E	0.090%	4.00%
Total		Total	ERR				ERR			100.000%	

NATIONAL SHELFLIST LC/SUBJECT CATEGORIES 1986 DATA

				EIU 85				EIU 86				
				TL	ESC	CCI	%	TL	ESC	CCI	%	CHANGE
68.	E	1-139	History of Americas: General, Indians, North America	1,040			0.398%	1,152	3B/E	3B/E	0.406%	10.77%
69.	E	140-200	United States, Colonial, Special Topics	3,376			1.293%	3,631	3B/E	3B/E	1.278%	7.55%
70.	E	201-299	United States, Revolutionary Period	433			0.166%	452	3B/E	3B/E	0.159%	4.39%
71.	E	301-440	United States, 1790-1855	871			0.333%	902	3B/E	3B/E	0.318%	3.56%
72.	E	441-655	United States, Slavery and Civil War	1,280			0.490%	1,356	3B/E	3B/E	0.477%	5.94%
73.	E	656-867	United States Since the Civil War	3,570			1.367%	3,828	3B/E	3B/E	1.347%	7.23%
74.	E	1-205	State & Local History: New England, Atlantic Coast	848			0.325%	894	3B/E	3B/E	0.315%	5.42%
75.	F	206-475	State & Local History: South, Gulf States	916			0.351%	969	3B/E	3B/E	0.341%	5.79%
76.	F	476-705	State & Local History: Midwest, Mississippi Valley	1,099			0.421%	1,193	3B/E	3B/E	0.420%	8.55%
77.	F	721-854	State & Local History: The West	331			0.127%	353	3B/E	3B/E	0.124%	6.65%
78.	F	856-975	State & Local History: Pacific Coast, Alaska	355			0.136%	399	3A/E	3A/E	0.140%	12.39%
120.	HM		Sociology: General Works, Theory	2,168	3B/E	3B/E	0.830%	2,252	3B/E	3B/E	0.793%	3.87%
121.	HN		Sociology: Social History and Conditions, Etc.	1,614	3B/E	3B/E	0.618%	1,672	3B/E	3B/E	0.589%	3.59%
122.	HQ		Family, Marriage, Woman, Sexual Life	4,014	3B/E	3B/E	1.537%	4,308	3B/E	3B/E	1.516%	7.32%
123.	HS		Societies: Secret, Benevolent, etc.	62	3A/E	3A/E	0.024%	70	3A/E	3A/E	0.025%	12.90%
124.	HT		Communities, Classes, Races	1,160	3B/E	3B/E	0.444%	1,215	3B/E	3B/E	0.428%	4.74%
125.	HV		Social Pathology, Welfare, Criminology	4,477	3B/E	3B/E	1.714%	4,970	3B/E	3B/E	1.749%	11.01%
147.	L		Education-General	716			0.274%	776	2/E	3/E	0.273%	8.38%
148.	LA		History of Education	2,245			0.860%	2,305	2/E	3/E	0.811%	2.67%
149.	LB		Theory & Practice of Education	12,632			4.836%	13,011	3A/E	3B/E	4.580%	3.00%
150.	LC		Special Aspects of Education	2,870			1.099%	3,023	2/E	3/E	1.064%	5.33%
151.	LD		Education: Individual Institutions: United States	467			0.179%	494	2/E	2/E	0.174%	5.78%
152.	LE		Education: Institutions: America (Except United States)	12			0.005%	12	1/E	1/E	0.004%	0.00%
153.	LF		Education: Individual Institutions: Europe	77			0.029%	79	1/E	1/E	0.028%	2.60%
154.	LG		Education: Institutions: Asia, Africa, Oceania	8			0.003%	9	1/E	1/E	0.003%	12.50%
155.	LH		College & School Magazines and Papers	20			0.008%	22	1/E	1/E	0.008%	10.00%
156.	LJ		Student Fraternities and Societies	16			0.006%	23	1/E	1/E	0.008%	43.75%
157.	LT		Textbooks	7			0.003%	7	1/E	1/E	0.002%	0.00%
158.	M	1-4	Music: Collections, Manuscripts, Collected Works, etc.	397			0.152%	415	3B/F	3B/F	0.146%	4.53%
159.	M	5-1490	Instrumental Music, Music Before 1700	3,650			1.397%	5,031	3B/E	3B/E	1.771%	37.84%
160.	M	1495-5000	Vocal Music	1,734			0.664%	2,456	3B/F	3B/F	0.865%	41.64%
161.	ML		Literature of Music	4,858			1.860%	5,153	3B/E	3B/E	1.814%	6.07%
162.	MT		Musical Instruction and Study	2,198			0.842%	2,283	3A/E	3B/E	0.804%	3.87%
163.	N		Visual Arts (General)	2,650	3A/E	3B/E	1.015%	2,858	3A/E	3B/E	1.006%	7.85%
164.	NA		Architecture	1,334	2/E	2/E	0.511%	1,441	2/E	2/E	0.507%	8.02%
165.	NB		Sculpture	611	3A/E	3A/E	0.234%	642	3A/E	3A/E	0.226%	5.07%
166.	NC		Graphic Arts (General), Drawing, Design	716	2/E	2/E	0.274%	776	2/E	2/E	0.273%	8.38%
167.	ND		Painting	2,296	3B/E	3B/E	0.879%	2,407	3B/E	3B/E	0.847%	4.83%
168.	NE		Print Media: Printmaking, Engraving, Lithography, etc.	370	2/E	2/E	0.142%	288	2/E	2/E	0.101%	-22.16%
169.	NK		Decorative Arts, Applied Arts, Crafts	1,530	2/E	2/E	0.586%	1,632	2/E	2/E	0.574%	6.67%
170.	NX		Arts in General	238	3A/E	3A/E	0.091%	265	3A/E	3A/E	0.093%	11.34%
316.	PR	1-78	English Literature: Literary History and Criticism	742	3B/E	3B/E	0.284%	884	3B/E	3B/E	0.311%	19.14%
317.	PR	81-151	History of English Literature, General	248	3B/E	3B/E	0.095%	254	3B/E	3B/E	0.089%	2.42%
318.	PR	161-479	History of English Literature, by Period	442	3B/E	3B/E	0.169%	460	3B/E	3B/E	0.162%	4.07%
319.	PR	500-978	History of English Literature, by Form (Poetry, Drama, etc)	949	3B/E	3B/E	0.361%	990	3B/E	3B/E	0.348%	4.32%

			EIU 85				EIU 86				
320.	PR 1098-1395	English Literature: Collections	742	3B/E	3B/E	0.284%	7..	3B/E	3B/E	0.270%	3..
321.	PR 1490-1799	Anglo-Saxon Literature	74	3A/E	3B/E	0.028%	80	3A/E	3B/E	0.02B%	8.11%
322.	PR 1803-2165	Anglo-Norman and Early Middle English Literature	320	3B/E	3B/E	0.123%	342	3B/E	3B/E	0.120%	6.88%
323.	PR 2199-2405	English Renaissance Literature, Prose and Poetry	313	3B/E	3B/E	0.120%	320	3B/E	3B/E	0.113%	2.24%
324.	PR 2411-2416	English Renaissance Drama: Anonymous Plays	4	1/E	1/E	0.002%	4	1/E	1/E	0.001%	0.00%
325.	PR 2417-2749	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights A-Shaj	259	3B/E	3B/E	0.099%	265	3B/E	3B/E	0.093%	2.32%
326.	PR 2750-3112	Shakespeare	994	3B/E	3B/E	0.381%	1,076	3B/E	3B/E	0.379%	8.25%
327.	PR 3135-3198	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights Shar-Z	31	3B/E	3B/E	0.012%	32	3B/E	3B/E	0.011%	3.23%
328.	PR 3291-3785	English Literature, 17th and 18th Centureis	1,246	3B/E	3B/E	0.477%	1,288	3B/E	3B/E	0.453%	3.37%
329.	PR 3991-5990	English Literature, 19th Century	2,482	3B/E	3B/E	0.950%	2,762	3B/E	3B/E	0.972%	11.29%
330.	PR 6000-6049	English Literature, 1900-1960	2,601	3B/E	3B/E	0.996%	2,782	3B/E	3B/E	0.979%	6.96%
331.	PR 6050-6076	English Literature, 1961-	540	3B/E	3B/E	0.207%	577	3B/E	3B/E	0.203%	6.85%
332.	PR 8309-9899	English Literature: Provincial, Colonial, etc.	250	3A/E	3B/E	0.096%	271	3A/E	3B/E	0.095%	8.40%
333.	PS 1-478	American Literature: General, Criticism, History	3,560			1.363%	4,393	3B/E	3B/E	1.546%	23.40%
334.	PS 501-690	American Literature: Collections	622			0.238%	675	3B/E	3B/E	0.238%	8.52%
335.	PS 700-893	American Literature: Colonial Period	52			0.020%	54	3B/E	3B/E	0.019%	3.85%
336.	PS 991-3390	American Literature: 19th Century	1,727			0.661%	1,998	3B/E	3B/E	0.703%	15.69%
337.	PS 3500-3549	American Literature: 1900-1960	3,069			1.175%	3,580	3B/E	3B/E	1.260%	16.65%
338.	PS 3550-3576	American Literature: 1961-	1,083			0.415%	1,283	3B/E	3B/E	0.452%	18.47%
364.	QA 1-99	Mathematics (General)	1,573	3B/E	3B/E	0.602%	1,729	3B/E	3B/E	0.609%	9.92%
365.	QA 101-145	Arithmetic	185	2/E	3A/E	0.071%	212	2/E	3A/E	0.075%	14.59%
366.	QA 150-299	Algebra	1,641	3B/E	3B/E	0.628%	1,708	3B/E	3B/E	0.601%	4.08%
367.	QA 300-433	Mathematical Analysis (Calculus, etc.)	1,086	3A/E	3A/E	0.416%	1,126	3A/E	3A/E	0.396%	3.68%
368.	QA 440-799	Geometry, Trigonometry	675	3B/E	3B/E	0.258%	723	3B/E	3B/E	0.254%	7.11%
369.	QA 801-939	Analytic Mechanics	199	2/E	2/E	0.076%	207	2/E	2/E	0.073%	4.02%
387.	QH 1-199	Natural History (General)	537			0.206%	603	2/E	1/E	0.212%	12.29%
388.	QH 201-278	Microscopy	111			0.042%	119	3A/E	2/E	0.042%	7.21%
389.	QH 301-705	Biology (General)	1,732			0.663%	1,891	3B/E	3/E	0.666%	9.18%
390.	QK 1-474	Botany (General)	456			0.175%	481	3A/E	3/E	0.169%	5.48%
391.	QK 475-989	Botany (Specific Fields)	1,259			0.482%	1,366	3B/E	3/E	0.481%	8.50%
392.	QL 1-355	Zoology (General)	500			0.191%	434	2/E	2/E	0.153%	-13.20%
393.	QL 362-739	Invertebrate and Vertebrate Zoology	1,826			0.699%	2,018	3A/E	3/E	0.710%	10.51%
394.	QL 750-991	Ethology, Anatomy, Embryology	520			0.199%	559	3B/E	3/E	0.197%	7.50%
395.	QM	Human Anatomy (B)	164			0.063%	197	2/E	1/E	0.069%	20.12%
396.	QP 1-348	Physiology (General) (B)	956			0.366%	1,045	3A/E	3/E	0.368%	9.31%
397.	QP 351-499	Nervous System and the Senses(B)	522			0.200%	555	3A/E	3/E	0.195%	6.32%
398.	QP 501-801	Animal Biochemistry (B)	444			0.170%	466	3B/E	3/E	0.164%	4.95%
399.	QP 901-981	Experimental Pharmacology (B)	29			0.011%	32	1	0	0.011%	10.34%
400.	QR	Microbiology (B)	495			0.190%	525	3/B	3/E	0.185%	6.06%
Total		Total	ERR				ERR			100.000%	

	NATIONAL SHELFLIST LC/SUBJECT CATEGORIES		IL STATE 85				IL STATE 86				
			IL	ESC	CCI	%	IL	ESC	CCI	%	CHANGE
68.	E 1-139	History of Americas: General, Indians, North America	3,081			0.513%	3,253	3E/F	3E/F	0.507%	5.58%
69.	E 140-200	United States, Colonial, Special Topics	6,715			1.118%	6,996	3E/F	3E/F	1.091%	4.18%
70.	E 201-299	United States, Revoluntionary Period	869			0.145%	880	3E/F	3E/F	0.137%	1.27%
71.	E 301-440	United States, 1790-1855	1,399			0.233%	1,428	3E/F	3E/F	0.223%	2.07%
72.	E 441-655	United States, Slavery and Civil War	3,620			0.602%	4,156	4E/F	4E/F	0.648%	14.81%
73.	E 656-867	United States Since the Civil War	3,189			0.531%	3,288	3/E	3/E	0.513%	3.10%
74.	E 1-205	State & Local History: New England, Atlantic Coast	1,716			0.286%	1,781	2/E	2/E	0.278%	3.79%
75.	F 206-475	State & Local History: South, Gulf States	1,873			0.312%	1,964	2/E	2/E	0.306%	4.86%
76.	F 476-705	State & Local History: Midwest, Mississippi Valley	2,544			0.423%	2,628	4E/F	4E/F	0.410%	3.30%
77.	F 721-854	State & Local History: The West	824			0.137%	846	2/E	2/E	0.132%	2.67%
78.	F 856-975	State & Local History: Pacific Coast, Alaska	900			0.150%	933	2/E	2/E	0.146%	3.67%
120.	HM	Sociology: General Works, Theory	3,499	3B/E	3B/E	0.582%	3,696	3B/E	3B/E	0.576%	5.63%
121.	HN	Sociology: Social History and Conditions, Etc.	3,140	3B/E	3B/E	0.523%	3,303	3B/E	3B/E	0.515%	5.19%
122.	HQ	Family, Marriage, Woman, Sexual Life	5,321	3B/E	3B/E	0.886%	5,752	3B/E	3B/E	0.897%	8.10%
123.	HS	Societies: Secret, Benevolent, etc.	230	2/E	2/E	0.038%	231	2/E	2/E	0.036%	0.43%
124.	HT	Communities, Classes, Races	2,640	3B/E	3B/E	0.439%	2,768	3B/E	3B/E	0.432%	4.85%
125.	HV	Social Pathology, Welfare, Criminology	8,278	3A/E	3B/E	1.378%	8,910	3A/E	3B/E	1.390%	7.63%
147.	L	Education-General	2,144			0.357%	2,193	3A/E	3A/E	0.342%	2.29%
148.	LA	History of Education	2,985			0.497%	3,110	4/E	3B/E	0.485%	4.19%
149.	LB	Theory & Practice of Education	18,660			3.106%	19,635	4/E	4/E	3.062%	5.23%
150.	LC	Special Aspects of Education	6,198			1.032%	6,603	4/E	4/E	1.030%	6.53%
151.	LD	Education: Individual Institutions: United States	4,991			0.831%	5,200	3A/E	3A/E	0.811%	4.19%
152.	LE	Education: Institutions: America (Except United States)	37			0.006%	39	1/E	1/E	0.006%	5.41%
153.	LF	Education: Individual Institutions: Europe	203			0.034%	207	1/E	1/E	0.032%	1.97%
154.	LG	Education: Institutions: Asia, Africa, Oceania	46			0.008%	47	1/E	1/E	0.007%	2.17%
155.	LH	College & School Magazines and Papers	13			0.002%	13	0	0	0.002%	0.00%
156.	LJ	Student Fraternities and Societies	129			0.021%	129	1/E	1/E	0.020%	0.00%
157.	LT	Textbooks	8			0.001%	8	3A/E	3A/E	0.001%	0.00%
158.	M 1-4	Music: Collections, Manuscripts, Collected Works, etc.	3,350			0.558%	3,529	3B	3B	0.550%	5.34%
159.	M 5-1490	Instrumental Music, Music Before 1700	13,848			2.305%	15,351	3B	3B	2.394%	10.85%
160.	M 1495-5000	Vocal Music	5,409			0.900%	5,788	3B	3B	0.903%	7.01%
161.	ML	Literature of Music	10,160			1.691%	10,802	3B/E	3B/E	1.685%	6.32%
162.	MT	Musical Instruction and Study	3,121			0.519%	3,240	3B/E	3B/E	0.505%	3.81%
163.	N	Visual Arts (General)	7,608	3B/F	3B/F	1.266%	8,097	3B/F	3B/F	1.263%	6.43%
164.	NA	Architecture	3,547	3B/F	3B/F	0.590%	3,741	3B/F	3B/F	0.583%	5.47%
165.	NB	Sculpture	1,638	3B/F	3B/F	0.273%	1,719	3B/F	3B/F	0.268%	4.95%
166.	NC	Graphic Arts (General), Drawing, Design	2,301	3B/F	3B/F	0.383%	2,424	3B/F	3B/F	0.378%	5.35%
167.	ND	Painting	6,807	3B/F	3B/F	1.133%	7,078	3B/F	3B/F	1.104%	3.98%
168.	NE	Print Media: Printmaking, Engraving, Lithography, etc.	1,389	3B/F	3B/F	0.231%	1,456	3B/F	3B/F	0.227%	4.82%
169.	NK	Decorative Arts, Applied Arts, Crafts	3,596	3B/F	3B/F	0.598%	3,714	3B/F	3B/F	0.579%	3.28%
170.	NX	Arts in General	775	3B/E	3B/E	0.129%	884	3B/E	3B/E	0.138%	14.06%
316.	PR 1-78	English Literature: Literary History and Criticism	447	4/E	4/E	0.074%	464	4/E	4/E	0.072%	3.80%
317.	PR 81-151	History of English Literature, General	533	4/E	4/E	0.089%	542	4/E	4/E	0.085%	1.69%
318.	PR 161-479	History of English Literature, by Period	766	4/E	4/E	0.127%	815	4/E	4/E	0.127%	6.40%
319.	PR 500-978	History of English Literature, by Form (Poetry, Drama, etc)	1,600	4/E	4/E	0.266%	1,727	4/E	4/E	0.269%	7.94%

			IL STATE 85				IL STATE 86				
320.	PR 1098-1395	English Literature: Collections	2,221	4/E	4/E	0.370%	2,893	4/E	4/E	0.451%	30.26%
321.	PR 1490-1799	Anglo-Saxon Literature	182	3/E	3/E	0.030%	188	3/E	3/E	0.029%	3.30%
322.	PR 1803-2165	Anglo-Norman and Early Middle English Literature	587	3/E	3/E	0.098%	618	3/E	3/E	0.096%	5.28%
323.	PR 2199-2405	English Renaissance Literature, Prose and Poetry	549	4/E	4/E	0.091%	567	4/E	4/E	0.088%	3.28%
324.	PR 2411-2416	English Renaissance Drama: Anonymous Plays	13	4/E	4/E	0.002%	13	4/E	4/E	0.002%	0.00%
325.	PR 2417-2749	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights A-Sha	475	4/E	4/E	0.079%	484	4/E	4/E	0.075%	1.89%
326.	PR 2750-3112	Shakespeare	2,454	4/E	4/E	0.408%	2,527	4/E	4/E	0.394%	2.97%
327.	PR 3135-3198	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights Shar-Z	65	4/E	4/E	0.011%	65	4/E	4/E	0.010%	0.00%
328.	PR 3291-3785	English Literature, 17th and 18th Centureis	2,484	4/E	4/E	0.413%	2,565	4/E	4/E	0.400%	3.26%
329.	PR 3991-5990	English Literature, 19th Century	8,383	4/E	4/E	1.395%	8,643	4/E	4/E	1.348%	3.10%
330.	PR 6000-6049	English Literature, 1900-1960	11,379	2/E	2/E	1.894%	11,700	2/E	2/E	1.825%	2.82%
331.	PR 6050-6076	English Literature, 1961-	4,092	2/E	2/E	0.681%	4,579	2/E	2/E	0.714%	11.90%
332.	PR 8309-9699	English Literature: Provincial, Colonial, etc.	1,500	2/E	2/E	0.250%	1,682	2/E	2/E	0.262%	12.13%
333.	PS 1-478	American Literature: General, Criticism, History	2,254			0.375%	2,419	4/E	4/E	0.377%	7.32%
334.	PS 501-690	American Literature: Collections	1,082			0.180%	1,174	4/E	4/E	0.183%	8.50%
335.	PS 700-893	American Literature: Colonial Period	128			0.021%	131	4/E	4/E	0.020%	2.34%
336.	PS 991-3390	American Literature: 19th Century	4,845			0.806%	4,961	4/E	4/E	0.774%	2.39%
337.	PS 3500-3549	American Literature: 1900-1960	11,847			1.972%	12,240	3/E	3/E	1.909%	3.32%
338.	PS 3550-3576	American Literature: 1961-	7,691			1.280%	8,599	3/E	3/E	1.341%	11.81%
364.	QA 1-99	Mathematics (General)	3,649	3B/E	3B/E	0.607%	4,282	3B/E	3B/E	0.668%	17.35%
365.	QA 101-145	Arithmetic	404	3A/E	3A/E	0.067%	413	3A/E	3A/E	0.064%	2.23%
366.	QA 150-299	Algebra	2,108	3A/E	3A/E	0.351%	2,279	3A/E	3A/E	0.355%	8.11%
367.	QA 300-433	Mathematical Analysis (Calculus, etc.)	1,164	3B/E	3B/E	0.194%	1,263	3B/E	3B/E	0.197%	8.51%
368.	QA 440-799	Geometry, Trigonometry	508	3A/E	3A/E	0.085%	549	3A/E	3A/E	0.086%	8.07%
369.	QA 801-939	Analytic Mechanics	232	3B/E	3B/E	0.039%	242	3B/E	3B/E	0.038%	4.31%
387.	QH 1-199	Natural History (General)	1,073			0.179%	1,144	3B/E	3B/E	0.178%	6.62%
388.	QH 201-278	Microscopy	178			0.030%	186	3A/E	3B/E	0.029%	4.49%
389.	QH 301-705	Biology (General)	3,827			0.637%	4,036	3B/E	3B/E	0.629%	5.46%
390.	QK 1-474	Botany (General)	758			0.126%	779	3A/E	3B/E	0.121%	2.77%
391.	QK 475-989	Botany (Specific Fields)	2,090			0.348%	2,203	3B/E	4/F	0.344%	5.41%
392.	QL 1-355	Zoology (General)	707			0.118%	727	3A/E	3B/E	0.113%	2.83%
393.	QL 362-739	Invertebrate and Vertebrate Zoology	4,156			0.692%	4,348	3B/E	4/F	0.678%	4.62%
394.	QL 750-991	Ethology, Anatomy, Embryology	1,337			0.223%	1,375	3B/E	3B/E	0.214%	2.84%
395.	QM	Human Anatomy (B)	453			0.075%	470	3A/E	3A/E	0.073%	3.75%
396.	QP 1-348	Physiology (General) (B)	2,232			0.371%	2,351	3B/E	4/F	0.367%	5.33%
397.	QP 351-499	Nervous System and the Senses(B)	957			0.159%	1,048	3B/E	3B/E	0.163%	9.51%
398.	QP 501-801	Animal Biochemistry (B)	957			0.159%	1,063	3B/E	4/F	0.166%	11.08%
399.	QP 901-981	Experimental Pharmacology (B)	47			0.008%	46	2/E	2/E	0.007%	-2.13%
400.	QR	Microbiology (B)	1,052			0.175%	1,146	4/F	4/F	0.179%	8.94%

	NATIONAL SHELFLIST LC/SUBJECT CATEGORIES			UIUC 85				UIUC 86				
				TL	ESC	CCI	%	TL	ESC	CCI	%	CHANGE
68.	E 1-139	History of Americas: General, Indians, North America		3,657			0.135%	4,137	4/F	3/F	0.143%	13.13%
69.	E 140-200	United States, Colonial, Special Topics		4,044			0.149%	4,420	4/W	3/F	0.152%	9.30%
70.	E 201-299	United States, Revoluntionary Period		1,613			0.060%	1,642	4/W	3/F	0.057%	1.80%
71.	E 301-440	United States, 1790-1855		1,959			0.072%	1,996	4/W	4/W	0.069%	1.89%
72.	E 441-655	United States, Slavery and Civil War		7,533			0.278%	7,723	4/W	4/W	0.266%	2.52%
73.	E 656-867	United States Since the Civil War		2,391			0.088%	2,497	4/W	3/W	0.086%	4.43%
74.	E 1-205	State & Local History: New England, Atlantic Coast		2,227			0.082%	2,344	4/E	3/E	0.081%	5.25%
75.	F 206-475	State & Local History: South, Gulf States		2,818			0.104%	3,044	4/E	3/E	0.105%	8.02%
76.	F 476-705	State & Local History: Midwest, Mississippi Valley		3,798			0.140%	4,094	4/F	4/F	0.141%	7.79%
77.	F 721-854	State & Local History: The West		1,064			0.039%	1,252	4/F	3/F	0.043%	17.67%
78.	F 856-975	State & Local History: Pacific Coast, Alaska		1,177			0.043%	1,292	3/F	3/F	0.045%	9.77%
120.	HM	Sociology: General Works, Theory		4,104	4/F	4/F	0.152%	5,413	4/F	4/F	0.187%	31.90%
121.	HN	Sociology: Social History and Conditions, Etc.		11,901	4/F	4/F	0.440%	12,068	4/F	4/F	0.416%	1.40%
122.	HQ	Family, Marriage, Woman, Sexual Life		3,994	4/F	4/F	0.148%	5,251	4/F	4/F	0.181%	31.47%
123.	HS	Societies: Secret, Benevolent, etc.		2,265	4/F	4/F	0.084%	2,320	4/F	4/F	0.080%	2.43%
124.	HT	Communities, Classes, Races		22,168	4/F	4/F	0.819%	24,495	4/F	4/F	0.844%	10.50%
125.	HV	Social Pathology, Welfare, Criminology		25,929	4/F	4/F	0.958%	28,423	4/F	4/F	0.979%	9.62%
147.	L	Education-General		10,945			0.404%	12,895	4/F	4/F	0.444%	17.82%
148.	LA	History of Education		6,526			0.241%	6,874	4/F	4/F	0.237%	5.33%
149.	LB	Theory & Practice of Education		39,556			1.462%	41,300	4/F	4/F	1.423%	4.41%
150.	LC	Special Aspects of Education		15,298			0.565%	16,030	4/F	4/F	0.552%	4.78%
151.	LD	Education: Individual Institutions: United States		2,052			0.076%	2,152	4/F	4/F	0.074%	4.87%
152.	LE	Education: Institutions: America (Except United States)		329			0.012%	356	4/F	4/F	0.012%	8.21%
153.	LF	Education: Individual Institutions: Europe		1,710			0.063%	1,828	4/F	4/F	0.063%	6.90%
154.	LG	Education: Institutions: Asia, Africa, Oceania		698			0.026%	789	4/F	4/F	0.027%	13.04%
155.	LH	College & School Magazines and Papers		46			0.002%	47	4/F	4/F	0.002%	2.17%
156.	LJ	Student Fraternities and Societies		1,695			0.063%	1,714	4/F	4/F	0.059%	1.12%
157.	LT	Textbooks		6			0.000%	6	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0.00%
158.	M 1-4	Music: Collections, Manuscripts, Collected Works, etc.		1,984			0.073%	2,433	4	4	0.084%	22.63%
159.	M 5-1490	Instrumental Music, Music Before 1700		47,917			1.770%	52,815	4	4	1.820%	10.22%
160.	M 1495-5000	Vocal Music		22,969			0.849%	28,295	4	4	0.975%	23.19%
161.	ML	Literature of Music		22,963			0.848%	24,836	4/W	4/W	0.856%	8.16%
162.	MT	Musical Instruction and Study		2,784			0.103%	3,225	3/B	3/B	0.111%	15.84%
163.	N	Visual Arts (General)		16,692	4/W	4/W	0.617%	17,902	4/W	4/W	0.617%	7.25%
164.	NA	Architecture		19,725	4/W	4/W	0.729%	20,737	4/W	4/W	0.715%	5.13%
165.	NB	Sculpture		6,988	4/W	4/W	0.258%	7,502	4/W	4/W	0.259%	7.36%
166.	NC	Graphic Arts (General), Drawing, Design		4,983	3B/W	3B/W	0.184%	5,267	3B/W	3B/W	0.182%	5.70%
167.	ND	Painting		16,721	4/W	4/W	0.618%	17,933	4/W	4/W	0.618%	7.25%
168.	NE	Print Media: Printmaking, Engraving, Lithography, etc.		2,800	4/W	4/W	0.103%	2,988	4/W	4/W	0.103%	6.71%
169.	NK	Decorative Arts, Applied Arts, Crafts		5,512	3B/W	3B/W	0.204%	5,948	3B/W	3B/W	0.205%	7.91%
170.	NX	Arts in General		890	3B/W	3B/W	0.033%	1,092	3B/W	3B/W	0.038%	22.70%
316.	PR 1-78	English Literature: Literary History and Criticism		85,748	4/F	4/F	3.168%	89,077	4/F	4/F	3.070%	3.88%
317.	PR 81-151	History of English Literature, General		12	4/F	4/F	0.000%	12	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0.00%
318.	PR 161-479	History of English Literature, by Period		4	4/F	4/F	0.000%	4	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0.00%
319.	PR 500-978	History of English Literature, by Form (Poetry, Drama, etc)		5	4/F	4/F	0.000%	5	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0.00%

			UIUC 85				UIUC 86			
320.	PR 1098-1395	English Literature: Collections	6	4/F	4/F	0.000%	7	4/F	4/F	0.000%	16.67%
321.	PR 1490-1799	Anglo-Saxon Literature	571	4/F	4/F	0.021%	585	4/F	4/F	0.020%	2.45%
322.	PR 1803-2165	Anglo-Norman and Early Middle English Literature	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	ERR
323.	PR 2199-2485	English Renaissance Literature, Prose and Poetry	1	4/F	4/F	0.000%	1	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0.00%
324.	PR 2411-2416	English Renaissance Drama: Anonymous Plays	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	ERR
325.	PR 2417-2749	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights A-Shaj	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	ERR
326.	PR 2750-3112	Shakespeare	70	S/W	S/W	0.003%	71	S/W	S/W	0.002%	1.43%
327.	PR 3135-3198	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights Shar-Z	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	ERR
328.	PR 3291-3785	English Literature, 17th and 18th Centureis	9	S/W	S/W	0.000%	9	S/W	S/W	0.000%	0.00%
329.	PR 3991-5990	English Literature, 19th Century	26	4/F	4/F	0.001%	29	4/F	4/F	0.001%	11.54%
330.	PR 6000-6049	English Literature, 1900-1960	17	4/F	4/F	0.001%	18	4/F	4/F	0.001%	5.88%
331.	PR 6050-6076	English Literature, 1961-	0	4/F	4/F	0.000%	1	4/F	4/F	0.000%	ERR
332.	PR 8309-9699	English Literature: Provincial, Colonial, etc.	8	3/F	4/F	0.000%	8	3/F	4/F	0.000%	0.00%
333.	PS 1-478	American Literature: General, Criticism, History	64,507			2.383%	67,478	4/E	4/E	2.325%	4.61%
334.	PS 501-690	American Literature: Collections	3			0.000%	4	4/E	4/E	0.000%	33.33%
335.	PS 700-893	American Literature: Colonial Period	0			0.000%	0	3/E	4/E	0.000%	ERR
336.	PS 991-3390	American Literature: 19th Century	14			0.001%	14	4/E	4/E	0.000%	0.00%
337.	PS 3500-3549	American Literature: 1900-1960	26			0.001%	27	4/E	4/E	0.001%	3.85%
338.	PS 3550-3576	American Literature: 1961-	7			0.000%	9	4/E	4/E	0.000%	28.57%
364.	QA 1-99	Mathematics (General)	15,834	4/W	4/W	0.585%	19,313	4/W	4/W	0.666%	21.97%
365.	QA 101-145	Arithmetic	1,177	4/W	4/W	0.043%	1,189	4/W	4/W	0.041%	1.02%
366.	QA 150-299	Algebra	12,468	4/W	4/W	0.461%	13,491	4/W	4/W	0.465%	8.21%
367.	QA 300-433	Mathematical Analysis (Calculus, etc.)	8,970	4/W	4/W	0.331%	9,645	4/W	4/W	0.332%	7.53%
368.	QA 440-799	Geometry, Trigonometry	5,940	4/W	4/W	0.219%	6,183	4/W	4/W	0.213%	4.09%
369.	QA 801-939	Analytic Mechanics	2,434	4/W	4/W	0.090%	2,550	4/W	4/W	0.088%	4.77%
387.	QH 1-199	Natural History (General)	36			0.001%	41	4/F	4/F	0.001%	13.89%
388.	QH 201-278	Microscopy	618			0.023%	630	4/F	4/F	0.022%	1.94%
389.	QH 301-705	Biology (General)	10,165			0.376%	11,288	4/F	4/F	0.389%	11.05%
390.	QK 1-474	Botany (General)	2,304			0.085%	2,442	4/F	4/F	0.084%	5.99%
391.	QK 475-989	Botany (Specific Fields)	12,735			0.471%	13,333	4/F	4/F	0.459%	4.70%
392.	QL 1-355	Zoology (General)	2,159			0.080%	2,776	4/F	4/F	0.096%	28.58%
393.	QL 362-739	Invertebrate and Vertebrate Zoology	14,374			0.531%	15,342	4/F	4/F	0.529%	6.73%
394.	QL 750-991	Ethology, Anatomy, Embryology	4,769			0.176%	5,077	4/F	4/F	0.175%	6.46%
395.	QM	Human Anatomy (B)	1,033			0.038%	1,085	4/F	4/F	0.037%	5.03%
396.	QP 1-348	Physiology (General) (B)	8,632			0.319%	9,077	4/F	4/F	0.313%	5.16%
397.	QP 351-499	Nervous System and the Senses(B)	378			0.014%	379	4/F	4/F	0.013%	0.26%
398.	QP 501-801	Animal Biochemistry (B)	791			0.029%	907	4/F	4/F	0.031%	14.66%
399.	QP 901-981	Experimental Pharmacology (B)	2			0.000%	2	3B/F	3B/F	0.000%	0.00%
400.	QR	Microbiology (B)	878			0.032%	982	4/F	4/F	0.034%	11.85%

	NATIONAL SHELFLIST LC/SUBJECT CATEGORIES		1986 MATRIX TOTALS	1985 MATRIX TOTALS	CHANGE 85/86
68.	E 1-139	History of Americas: General, Indians, North America	33,318	30,953	7.64%
69.	E 140-200	United States, Colonial, Special Topics	67,053	61,668	8.73%
70.	E 201-299	United States, Revoluntionary Period	10,023	9,312	7.64%
71.	E 301-440	United States, 1790-1855	16,897	15,719	7.49%
72.	E 441-655	United States, Slavery and Civil War	34,760	32,741	6.17%
73.	E 656-867	United States Since the Civil War	38,730	35,994	7.60%
74.	E 1-205	State & Local History: New England, Atlantic Coast	17,014	15,662	8.63%
75.	F 206-475	State & Local History: South, Gulf Stetes	19,221	17,940	7.14%
76.	F 476-705	State & Local History: Midwest, Mississippi Valley	25,025	23,732	5.45%
77.	F 721-854	State & Local History: The West	8,406	7,880	6.68%
78.	F 856-975	State & Local History: Pacific Coast, Alaska	8,258	7,840	5.33%
120.	HM	Sociology: General Works, Theory	42,113	39,183	7.48%
121.	HN	Sociology: Social History and Conditions, Etc.	46,685	43,958	6.20%
122.	HQ	Family, Marriage, Woman, Sexual Life	60,128	55,881	7.60%
123.	HS	Societies: Secret, Benevolent, etc.	3,979	3,880	2.55%
124.	HT	Communities, Classes, Races	50,935	48,619	4.76%
125.	HV	Social Pathology, Welfare, Criminology	113,704	107,348	5.92%
147.	L	Education-General	31,189	29,318	6.38%
148.	LA	History of Education	35,663	33,585	6.19%
149.	LB	Theory & Practice of Education	217,067	203,654	6.59%
150.	LC	Special Aspects of Education	67,936	63,413	7.13%
151.	LD	Education: Individual Institutions: United States	22,767	22,239	2.37%
152.	LE	Education: Institutions: America (Except United States)	688	670	2.69%
153.	LF	Education: Individual Institutions: Europe	3,811	3,717	2.53%
154.	LG	Education: Institutions: Asia, Africa, Oceania	1,348	1,331	1.28%
155.	LH	College & School Magazines and Papers	139	133	4.51%
156.	LJ	Student Fraternities and Societies	2,547	2,507	1.60%
157.	LT	Textbooks	114	107	6.54%
158.	M 1-4	Music: Collections, Manuscripts, Collected Works, etc.	9,649	9,382	2.85%
159.	M 5-1490	Instrumental Music, Music Before 1700	107,317	106,776	0.51%
160.	M 1495-5000	Vocal Music	48,534	47,920	1.28%
161.	ML	Literature of Music	97,559	91,646	6.45%
162.	MT	Musical Instruction and Study	24,206	23,039	5.07%
163.	N	Visual Arts (General)	71,554	67,635	5.79%
164.	NA	Architecture	51,895	50,188	3.40%
165.	NB	Sculpture	20,423	19,639	3.99%
166.	NC	Graphic Arts (General), Drawing, Design	19,455	18,664	4.24%
167.	ND	Painting	67,427	64,249	4.95%
168.	NE	Print Media: Printmaking, Engraving, Lithography, etc.	11,719	11,123	5.36%
169.	NK	Decorative Arts, Applied Arts, Crafts	25,587	24,361	5.03%
170.	NX	Arts in General	6,356	5,873	8.22%
316.	PR 1-78	English Literature: Literary History and Criticism	163,940	155,512	5.42%
317.	PR 81-151	History of English Literature, General	4,429	4,135	7.11%
318.	PR 161-479	History of English Literature, by Period	6,982	6,432	8.55%
319.	PR 500-978	History of English Literature, by Form (Poetry, Drama, etc)	14,703	13,558	8.45%
320.	PR 1098-1395	English Literature: Collections	13,238	12,503	5.88%
321.	PR 1490-1799	Anglo-Saxon Literature	2,505	2,382	5.16%
322.	PR 1803-2165	Anglo-Norman and Early Middle English Literature	5,338	4,968	7.45%
323.	PR 2199-2405	English Renaissance Literature, Prose and Poetry	4,663	4,302	8.39%
324.	PR 2411-2416	English Renaissance Drama: Anonymous Plays	177	168	5.36%
325.	PR 2417-2749	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights A-Shaj	3,995	3,704	7.86%
326.	PR 2750-3112	Shakespeare	17,722	16,675	6.28%
327.	PR 3135-3198	English Renaissance Drama: Plays by Playwrights Shar-Z	534	499	7.01%
328.	PR 3291-3785	English Literature, 17th and 18th Centureis	20,750	19,315	7.43%
329.	PR 3991-5990	English Literature, 19th Century	50,017	46,329	7.96%
330.	PR 6000-6049	English Literature, 1900-1960	46,587	43,784	6.40%
331.	PR 6050-6076	English Literature, 1961-	12,019	11,169	7.61%
332.	PR 8309-9899	English Literature: Provincial, Colonial, etc.	6,770	6,215	8.93%

	NATIONAL SHELFLIST LC/SUBJECT CATEGORIES		1986 MATRIX TOTALS	1985 MATRIX TOTALS	CHANGE 85/86
333.	PS 1-478	American Literature: General, Criticism, History	142,412	134,255	6.08%
334.	PS 501-690	American Literature: Collections	9,337	8,606	8.49%
335.	PS 700-893	American Literature: Colonial Period	1,079	1,002	7.68%
336.	PS 991-3390	American Literature: 19th Century	32,957	30,674	7.44%
337.	PS 3500-3549	American Literature: 1900-1960	68,144	63,064	8.06%
338.	PS 3550-3576	American Literature: 1961-	31,101	28,503	9.11%
364.	QA 1-99	Mathematics (General)	64,980	60,218	7.91%
365.	QA 101-145	Arithmetic	4,739	4,431	6.95%
366.	QA 150-299	Algebra	43,661	41,464	5.30%
367.	QA 300-433	Mathematical Analysis (Calculus, etc.)	26,739	25,463	5.01%
368.	QA 440-799	Geometry, Trigonometry	15,101	14,342	5.29%
369.	QA 801-939	Analytic Mechanics	6,789	6,514	4.22%
387.	QH 1-199	Natural History (General)	10,974	10,307	6.47%
388.	QH 201-278	Microscopy	2,601	2,493	4.33%
389.	QH 301-705	Biology (General)	51,879	48,674	6.58%
390.	QK 1-474	Botany (General)	9,778	9,284	5.32%
391.	QK 475-989	Botany (Specific Fields)	32,921	31,379	4.91%
392.	QL 1-355	Zoology (General)	10,657	10,264	3.83%
393.	QL 362-739	Invertebrate and Vertebrate Zoology	49,792	47,447	4.94%
394.	QL 750-991	Ethology, Anatomy, Embryology	17,674	16,802	5.19%
395.	QM	Human Anatomy (B)	7,581	7,347	3.18%
396.	QP 1-348	Physiology (General) (B)	33,915	32,464	4.47%
397.	QP 351-499	Nervous System and the Senses(B)	8,836	8,239	7.25%
398.	QP 501-801	Animal Biochemistry (B)	11,171	10,550	5.89%
399.	QP 901-981	Experimental Pharmacology (B)	500	461	8.46%
400.	QR	Microbiology (B)	11,363	10,656	6.63%
Total		Total	8,597,993	8,162,937	5.33%

ATTACHMENT F

COMPARISON OF RESEARCH LEVEL COLLECTIONS AS INDICATED BY ESC'S IN 1986 ICAM

Library with Research Level (4) ESC indicator	# Titles	% of Collection
SUBJECT: History E 441-655 U.S. Slavery and Civil War		
Illinois State	4,156	.65
Northern Illinois	4,342	.60
SIU-C	3,542	.39
UIUC	7,723	.27
SUBJECT: Sociology HM		
Northern Illinois	4,659	.65
SIU-C	2,606	.29
UIUC	5,413	.19
SUBJECT: HN		
Northern Illinois	4,367	.61
SIU-C	4,152	.29
UIUC	12,068	.42
SUBJECT: HQ		
Eastern Illinois	4,308	1.51
Northern Illinois	7,255	1.01
SIU-C	2,918	.32
UIUC	5,251	.18
SUBJECT: HI		
Northern Illinois	3,198	.44
SIU-C	3,492	.39
UIUC	24,495	.84

Library with Research Level (4) ESC indicator	# Titles	% of Collection
SUBJECT: HV		
Northern Illinois	9,170	1.27
SIU-C	10,836	1.21
UIUC	28,423	.98
SUBJECT: Music M 1-4		
Eastern Illinois	415	1.46
SIU-C	317	.03
UIUC	2,433	.08
SUBJECT: M 5-1490		
Eastern Illinois	5,031	1.77
SIU-C	7,590	.85
UIUC	52,815	1.82
SUBJECT: M 1495-5000		
SIU-C	1,064	.12
UIUC	28,295	.97
SUBJECT: ML		
SIU-C	10,756	1.20
UIUC	24,836	.86

Literature was not compared because of difficulties in Dewey/LC Translation in this edition of ICAM. A Visual Arts subject category was claimed as a 4 ESC by only one library and thus comparison could not be done.